

F

ADD

J

A

POLITICAL TRACT.

BY THE

COBBETT CLUB OF LONDON.

No. I.

ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.



TO BE REPEATED OCCASIONALLY.

LONDON:

**J. CLEAVE, 1, SHOE LANE, FLEET STREET,
AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.**

1839.

PRICE SIX-PENCE.

CONTENTS.

	<i>Page.</i>
Introductory Address	3
On the Stamp Duties	10
Irish Poor Laws	13
Irish Coercion Bill	18
Corn Laws	19
Canadian Rebellion	27
Parliamentary Reform	35
Universal Suffrage	35
Is Education (" <i>Heddication</i> ") necessary to qualify men to exercise the Elective Franchise?	42
Vote by Ballot	44
Annual Parliaments and Payment of Members	45
Property Qualification for Members	48
Physical Force	49
Right of having Arms and Right of Resistance	51

Th
tha
pov
nic
diff
tion
his
sine
day
hap
ther
men
feet
prot
For
for
for
and
remo
to h
H
or, r
mon
vain
orga
men
almo
exan
whic
coun
Ne
heare
his
fully
we t
high
cause
the d
prod
disgr

A POLITICAL TRACT.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS.

THE Political writings of the late Mr. Cobbett, were the best that ever came from the press, for their clearness, simplicity and power; they were from the pen of a man who had a quick and nice perception of all the parts of a question, no matter how difficult or abstruse; whose force of argument, admirable illustrations and perspicuity were truly inimitable; added to which, his energy of character, his great integrity and undoubted sincerity, all combined to stamp him as the *master-spirit* of his day.

The writings of this wonderfully gifted man, we had the happiness of reading for many years, and we always found them calculated to better the condition of his fellow-countrymen: we always found his exertions directed to assist the feeble—to defend the oppressed, in short (in his own words), "*to protect defenceless innocence against the attacks of powerful guilt.*" For the possession of his gigantic talent we honoured him—for his exertions in the cause of true liberty we admired him—for his patriotism we revered him—for his virtues we loved him; and, now that he is dead, we are desirous to keep alive the remembrance of him, and to do all that we can to give currency to his numerous useful works.

His death created a void, which we have long been hoping, or, rather *wishing*, to see filled. But, alas! week after week, month after month, and year after year, have we waited in vain! London, we thought would, surely, produce some organ through which we, his disciples, should hear his sentiments; but, in that, we have been deceived, and are, now, almost in despair of ever seeing his vacant chair filled, and the example that he furnishes us widely imitated; the necessity for which is, every day, more apparent as the public affairs of our country approach their great crisis.

Newcastle-on-Tyne, the place that contains, as we have often heard Mr. COBBETT say, some of the best and most talented of his disciples, has sent forth its "*Northern Liberator*," which fully comes up to the *standard of Cobbettism*; most heartily do we thank its clever conductors for their exertions, and most highly do we honour them for those productions of theirs, that cause us to feel less keenly the loss that we have sustained by the death of our great apostle; but, those exertions and those productions of theirs, make us blush to the very bone, at the disgrace to the city where we are domiciled, from whence so

many of the glorious *Registers* darted their rays over our benighted country, when we reflect on the fact, that, in the very temple where he so long ministered, no voice should be heard to proclaim those principles that had been inculcated by him : no proper effort should have been made to extend those principles which we, his disciples, know are identified with the true interests of our country. These things have, at last, become irsupportable, and have made us resolve to endeavour to wipe away the foul reproach ; and, although we know that we are at an *immeasurable* distance below him in powers of mind, we are determined to do our best to advocate those principles that he has taught us :—although we well know that not the tenth part of a tithe of his wondrous talent is possessed by us, we hope to imitate his sterling integrity :—although tyranny will not, in us, have such powerful opponents, yet will we, to the utmost of our abilities, be its opponents :—although the servile slaves, who crouch at the foot of power, and are obsequiously doing its bidding, will not find us so able to give vent to loathing, to scorn, to withering indignation and bitter contempt of them, yet we hope to give proof that we “*hate them with a perfect hatred,*” and that we are anxious to follow his example towards them.

At the commencement of works of this kind, it is proper that the readers should be informed, in the plainest and most unequivocal manner, what are the principles that will be advocated in them, and that a clear statement should be given, of the manner in which they will be conducted, so that there may be nothing of a doubtful or uncertain character about them ; and so that, if there be the smallest departure from the path in which we originally started, immediate detection may follow. We especially desire to avoid adding to the number of those publications, which have, from time to time, been announced to the world under descriptions that have grossly deceived us, as we have found when the works themselves have made their appearance. Many have been the times when we have been delighted to hear that an “*unflinching advocate of the just rights of the people,*” was about to unsheath the pen in political strife :—when a “*bold and indefatigable denouncer of all abuses,*” was about to pour out the “*vials of his wrath*” on base public plunderers :—when an “*uncompromising champion of reform in Parliament*” was about to enter the list, to break a lance, in political warfare ; and, at length, when these *advocates, denouncers, and uncompromising champions*, have made their appearance, we have found them to be, in fact, “*advocates*” of things as they are : “*denouncers*” of all those who were for remedying all abuses, and “*uncompromising champions*” of the *enemies* of real reform.

Now, these things not only have been of *no good*, but they have been of *real injury* to the people. Of more injury than have been any of the candid, open, plain-spoken, *Tory* publications that have ever appeared ; and most desirous are we not to do, or to say, anything that will consign us to the category of such weak and wicked tricksters ; our desire being, that, whatever might be said of us, no one shall be able to say that our

principles are misunderstood, nor that our *sincerity*, in the advocacy of those principles, can fairly be doubted.

About a year ago, a society was formed in London under the designation of "THE COBBETT CLUB;" which consists, for the greater part, of men who were, for many years, the *personal friends* of the late MR. COBBETT, and who have united for the purpose of promoting the principles of which that great and good man was the teacher; amongst which, the following are the more prominent ones, and are, on that account, adopted as the TESTS by which candidates for admission into the COBBETT CLUB are tried.

"*First.* That it is necessary to the well being and good government of the people of this kingdom, that *Parliaments should be elected annually*:—That every man of mature age, of sound mind, and unstained by indelible crime, should have a vote in the choosing of Members of Parliament;—and, that they should vote for such Members by means of the *Ballot*.

"*Secondly.* That every individual if in want, has prescriptive and legal right to demand from the State, a sufficiency of every thing necessary to the maintenance of life and health.

"*Thirdly.* That there should be an "EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT" of the so-called "NATIONAL DEBT," and of all other burdens on the National industry.

These, then, are the principles on which our occasional publications will take their stand; and never will we be found finching from our duty in endeavouring to cause them to be extended; the best guarantee for which pledge is, that they are put forth by the COBBETT CLUB itself, and will be entirely under the management of that body. The reader may, therefore, be sure that in this holy cause we shall zealously devote the best of our abilities; and never shall we own that man as a *Radical*, who falls short in his firm adherence to those principles. We have not the vanity to imagine that we can bring a large stock of talent in aid of our resolution to do as much as we are able in this cause; nor have we the intolerable vanity to suppose that we can produce any thing that will not be at an immense and fearful distance from the excellence of the writings of the late Member for *Oldham*. If the whole of the political writers of the present day were *melted down into one*, we believe that the writings of that one would fall far short of those that have been produced by his gigantic mind; but, nevertheless, it is our duty to do the *best* we can, and *that* will we fearlessly do. We will endeavour to walk in the same path that he formed for himself, turning neither to the right hand, nor to the left hand: he shall be our guide, our polar star, our pillar of fire, to direct us in our way, and then we may be sure of having the cheering approbation of all those who were so long delighted and instructed by him: they will look with an indulgent eye on our efforts in the cause of truth and justice, and give us credit (whatever of feebleness they observe in us), for the *desire* to aid our fellow countrymen in effecting the

restoration of those rights that have been so long withheld from them, and in the doing of which we are not weak enough to expect to escape the consequences that usually attend the zealous performance of the duty of combating powerful corruption. Our great teacher has told us that, "every man who attacks corruption, who makes war upon the vile herd that live upon the people's labour, every such man must lay his account with being calumniated; he must expect to be the object of the bitterest and most persevering malice; and, unless he has made up his mind to the enduring of this, he had better at once quit the field. One of the weapons which corruption employs against her adversaries is calumny, secret as well as open. It is truly surprising to see how many ways she has of annoying her foes, and the artifices to which she stoops to arrive at her end. No sooner does a man become in any degree formidable to her, than she sets to work against him in all the relationships of life. In his profession, his trade, his family; amongst his friends, the companions of his sports, his neighbours and his servants. *She eyes him all round, she feels him all over, and if he has a vulnerable point, if he has a speck, however small, she is ready with her stab.* How many hundreds of men have been ruined by her without being hardly able to perceive, much less name, the cause; and how many thousands, seeing the fate of these hundreds, have withdrawn from the struggle, or have been deterred from taking a part in it!"

Those who will have to conduct these works, are *plain un-"hed-dicated" working men*, who, therefore, will not make any very brilliant display of literary talent; nor will they have any pretensions to rank with those sublime geniuses, belonging to the "*race that write*;" but, they will, to the best of their capability, give plain and honest statements of their opinions on the various political subjects that may arise, and present them to their readers divested of all that mystery and sublimity with which interested knaves always contrive to disguise them. They are quite prepared for the sneers and revilings of those who will think them guilty of sacrilege for daring to approach the hallowed precincts of the press:—quite prepared for the volleys of dull jests and pointless sarcasms that will be let fly at their devoted heads:—perfectly ready even for the ludicrous comparisons that will be made at their expense (and here there is good room for their talent at joking,) between them and that great man in whose steps they are endeavouring, in all humility, to tread. But, notwithstanding all these fearful trials of their courage and perseverance, they will, please God and their readers, plod on in their own homely manner, "armed so strong "in honesty" as to earn for themselves, they hope, the attention of those who have too much sense to be amused with merely ornamental phraseology, well balanced antitheses, artfully arranged alliterations and finely rounded periods; all very *pretty* in their way, but not sufficient to make amends for the absence of *common sense*, nor to satisfy the mind when reason and truth are set at nought, as too insignificant to be the main ingredients

in compositions on really weighty and important subjects. If they succeed in this, they will be consoled and cheered on in their course; and, as regards such opponents as those alluded to, they will endeavour to bear all their attacks with equanimity of temper and christian resignation, firmly believing, that, as in *religion*, "blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely," so it is in *politics*, "blessed are ye when the '*suck-mugs*,' and '*reporters*,' and '*best possible public instructors*' shall revile you and say all manner of evil against you."

In these works the proceedings in parliament, and public matters generally, will be investigated: the proceedings of Foreign Governments, as affecting England, will be closely watched and discussed; but, above all things else, a watchful eye will be kept on those matters that affect the well being of the *poorer part of the people*: those whose wishes are never consulted and whose good is never considered in any of the various changes that are made by those who have the power of making the laws, any more than if they were mere cattle on a farm; and never will their well being be considered by the makers of the laws until they have their full political rights; which, both factions are fully determined that they never shall have, if they can prevent it; knowing that, *then*, the good things of office and power would be lost for ever: that it would be, not merely their being for a time *driven away* from the tree of corruption, on whose fruit they have so long thriven, but, that it would be an *absolute cutting down of the tree itself*; rather than see which, they would see every man, woman and child tossed as food for the region kites! Of this we have damning proof in the fact of both of those hellish factions having joined in passing the horrible "*new Poor-Law*", which was passed for the *avowed* purpose of *causing the working people to live upon* "A COARSER SORT OF FOOD," and thus to bring them into a state of perfect helplessness in order that their powerful foes may be able to get *thirty or forty millions of pounds sterling a year out of their wages*; which thirty or forty millions of pounds are to be given to the *WEALTHY*, to *prevent their estates from being swallowed up* by the *three or four millions*, a year, of *poor's-rates*! whilst the *poor*, themselves, are to be denied all right to relief when they are unable to work, that is to say when *their estates are "swallowed up"*; or, at any rate, that their right to relief, as a little, *fretful*, Lord, in a certain House, once said, "*should be placed within as strict limits as any honourable gentleman could desire*; "*he was ready to reduce it as nearly as possible to the condition of* "ACTUAL STARVATION, because that was the best protection against "*fraudulent waste of money.*" If my Lord Stanley was ready to agree to this in 1836, has he given us reason to believe that he is not in the same mind *now*? and, if the House, in which this was uttered, could hear this without causing the roof of that house to ring with curses and execrations against the utterer of such sentiments (the equal of which, for atrocity, were never before uttered outside of hell), are we to believe that that house is not as likely to allow such language to be uttered, without execra-

tion, now as it was in 1836? And if such is the case, would it not be stark, staring, madness to expect that any thing, for the real good of the poor, could ever emanate from the acts of *such* a house? and how much greater would that madness be, that would affect to believe that *that* house would not move earth and hell to prevent these same people from having the power to bundle the seat fillers of that house, neck-and-heels, from their seats! And yet such power must, by hook or by crook, be possessed by the whole people, before their numerous sufferings, caused by *bad government*, can be removed; for from that source flow all the miseries and sufferings of the poor; and, that those miseries and sufferings will continue to exist, until *Universal Suffrage* and *Annual Parliaments* be obtained, is as clear as that effects follow causes. To assist in endeavouring to gain which, shall the utmost of our humble exertions be directed; knowing, as we do, that nothing else will be efficient for the purpose of eradicating them, and that, unless they be eradicated, our country will continue to dwindle away, and finally become a scorn and a by-word among nations; for no country can continue powerful if its government have not the confidence of the people, and no government can have the confidence of the people when not more than *one, out of every thirty-two*, has the right of voting in the election of those who have the making of the laws by which *ALL are to be governed!* In the nature of things it is *impossible* that such a government can have the confidence, or the willing support, of the people; and he must be a bold man who would say that it *ought* to have it.

Before going any further we ought to give our reasons for not publishing a *weekly* Political Register.—One reason, then, is, that those who have the conducting of this work are all, as working men, and tradesmen, *engaged in other business*, by which their livelihood is to be obtained, and, therefore, have not sufficient time, at their own disposal, to enable them to give proper attention to the necessary details of a *weekly* publication. Other reasons are to be found in the *Gagging Act* that has been passed, by the *reformed* parliament, for the purpose of *untrammelling* the press and giving *freedom* to political discussions. A few of the provisions of this act we will here give, to show how great the difficulty would be for persons, situated as we are, to conduct a *weekly* pamphlet, these are some of the provisions of the act.

“ **CLAUSE 166**—Declares that all political pamphlets published “ periodically and within a month, shall be considered news- “ papers.

“ **168.**—Before a Newspaper can be printed an affidavit must “ be made at the Stamp Office, setting forth the title of the Paper, “ intended printing office, and publishing office, private residence “ and names of printers and publishers, and of other persons in “ any other manner concerned in publishing such Newspaper, with “ the name of the proprietor, or two of the largest proprietors “ Affidavits to be renewed and amended in certain cases, and “ whenever required by the Commissioners.

" 169.—Penalty for printing a Paper without making the above affidavits, *One Hundred Pounds per day*. By the same clause every news-ender is rendered liable to the same penalty for selling or delivering out any such newspaper, although ignorant that the affidavits may not have been made in the form required by the act. Power is also given to the Commissioners of Stamps, to stop the issue of stamps until new affidavits have been made, whether necessary or not. In other words, the Commissioners are to be permitted to ruin any Paper they please, by insisting upon new forms of affidavits, with which—from the absence of the proprietors, or other causes—it may be impossible suddenly to comply.

" 170.—The affidavits to be evidence in an action at law against the printers, proprietors, or publishers, until new affidavits have been delivered that the parties have ceased to be connected with the paper.

" 171.—Service of legal process at the place of abode mentioned in the affidavit, to be deemed a legal service. *Personal service being dispensed with.*

" 174.—Every Newspaper printer, or publisher, in the United Kingdom, is required to send two copies of his Paper, *signed* with his own hand, within three days of the date of publication, to the Stamp Office in London, Edinburgh, or Dublin, and *between the hours of 10 and 3 in the day*. Publishers living in Cornwall or Northumberland, may petition for leave to send copies to a distributor of stamps within twenty or fifty miles, *and may be refused at pleasure of Commissioners.*—Every instance of neglect in forwarding copies within the appointed time, is to be visited with a penalty of *One Hundred Pounds*. The signed copies are to be evidence in a court of law for two years, against the parties.

" 175.—Besides the written signature, and the printed names of the printers and publisher in the Newspaper; it is also to contain a *true description of the house or building in which the same is actually printed*, and if that description differ in any respect from the description of the building in which the same was intended to be printed, as stated in the affidavit, for every such offence a penalty is inflicted of *One Hundred Pounds*.

" 176.—No printer can purchase stamps of a vendor of stamps, without first giving him a certificate that he (the purchaser) has fulfilled all the bonds and engagements required by the act, and which certificate must be signed by the Commissioners.

" A vendor selling stamps to persons disqualified, will be fined Fifty Pounds for every offence, and *the onus is to lie with the accused person to prove that he did not sell the stamps*, 'any law or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.'

" 177.—Persons concerned in printing and publishing unstamped newspapers, shall, upon a bill being filed against them, be compelled to make discovery of their own guilt, and shall all be equally liable for the unpaid duty.

" 178.—Any person having an unstamped Paper in his possession shall be liable to a penalty of *Twenty Pounds for every*

"such paper, or to be imprisoned for a term of not less than one month, and not exceeding six months.

"179.—Every person sending an unstamped Newspaper abroad, to be liable to a penalty of *One Hundred Pounds* for every such offence.

"180.—A bill may be filed against any person, without distinction, who shall thereby be compelled to make any discovery in his power of the printer, publisher, or proprietor of an unstamped Newspaper.

"181.—Any person more than twenty-eight days in arrear of payment of the advertisement duty shall thenceforth be disqualified to receive stamped paper, until the arrears be paid.

"182.—Every pamphlet, or literary work containing advertisements, must be entered within six, and in some cases within ten days at the Stamp Office, and the advertisement duty immediately paid under a penalty of *Twenty Pounds* for every offence. *Every person concerned in printing or publishing the Paper, is to be liable to the same penalties.*

"183.—The printing press and types employed in printing an unstamped Paper will be liable to be seized, without any other warrant than this act, *whoever may claim to be the real proprietors of the property.*

"By clause 239 every Justice of the Peace is required by the act, (no discretion being allowed) to grant upon the application of any Constable, Police Officer, or any Officer of Stamp Duties, a warrant to enter and search any house or place suspected to contain unstamped Newspapers, or Persons concerned in them, or printing presses which may at any time have been employed in printing unstamped Papers.

"By the same clause, the Officers are empowered to seize not only those presses, but also all other presses and printing materials found in the same house, (no matter to whom they belong) all of which are to be forfeited to his Majesty.

"By clause 241, Officers are permitted to break open doors and make forcible entry into private houses, shops, and offices in pursuance of the same object.

"248.—A Justice of the Peace may convict upon the evidence of one credible witness. The accused may appeal to the Quarter Sessions, but the cause cannot be moved by writ of Certiorari or otherwise, into any superior court.

"249.—Any common informer, entitled to a pecuniary reward in the event of conviction is to be admitted as a credible witness."

STAMP DUTIES.

HAVING now introduced ourselves to our future readers, we will take a brief review of a few of the more prominent political questions that have occupied the attention of the public, since Mr. Cobbett's death deprived his country of his great services. One of these subjects (the newspaper stamping bill,) we have already laid quite bare before our readers. Nothing that we

cor
go
wo
pe
of
ing
a r
on
be
lea
star
Con
wh
bee
dec
bro
he
Let
bro
he
"pe
"di
"su
"go
"ex
"N
"la
"sa
"on
"ve
"sh
"of
"on
"su
"fo
"pro
"tie
"ins
"po
"mo
"two
"cas
"and
"be
"the
"rich
"in
"Aft
duty i
two-
and t
TIME

could say would tend to make that matter more plain! it is so good, so complete, so perfect in all its parts, that it would be a work of down-right supererogation to explain it. Whatever people may say about the difficulty of *understanding* the meaning of those who pass acts of parliament, there is no misunderstanding the intentions, at any rate, of the "*pretty gentlemen*" who, in a *reformed* parliament passed this act. To say any thing more on this *muzzling* and *gagging* and *hand-cuffing* law would indeed be to "gild refined gold" and therefore we respectfully take our leave of it for the present.

But there is, in connexion with this law, the subject of the *stamp duties*, which was brought before the notice of the House of Commons, by MR. COBBETT, in 1833. On which *Mr. Spring Rice*, who had come reeling into the house at a late hour, (having been to a public dinner) and, being inspired by *Bacchus*, declared, that, whenever the Honourable member for Oldham brought forward his resolutions on the subject of the *stamp-taxes*, he would fight him "*fat to fat and shouldther to shouldther*"! Let us now see how the fight "came off". MR. COBBETT brought forward his resolutions at the appointed time, in which he complained that "the various duties on *legacies*, and on property coming by *intestate succession*, are imposed applicable to different degrees of relationship between the legatees and the successors and the deceased, beginning at *one per cent*, and going on to *ten per cent*; but, that *freehold property is wholly exempt from this tax*, and that, of course the *large estates* of the NOBILITY and LANDED GENTRY (including advowsons and lay-tithes) ARE EXEMPTED! while if a deceased leave a thousand pounds to a distant relation, that relation will have to pay *one hundred pounds*". He also went on to show that in *conveyances* the duty on any thing of five pounds value is ten shillings (or *ten per cent*) whilst if the property conveyed be of *five hundred thousand pounds value*, the duty would be only *one thousand pounds* (only three-sixteenths per cent!) and in such a case the *poor man* would pay more, in proportion, than FORTY TIMES as much as the RICH MAN on the same sort of property.—That, in the case of mortgages, bonds and securities of every description, if the amount of the mortgage, for instance, be *twenty-five pounds*, the amount of the stamp is one pound, or FOUR POUNDS per cent; but, if the amount of the mortgage be *twenty thousand pounds*, the amount of the stamp is twenty pounds, or TWO SHILLINGS per cent! and that in this case, the *poor man* pays forty times as much as the *rich man*! and that the stamp is not more if the amount of the mortgage be *one hundred thousand pounds*; so that, in a case like this, the *poor man* pays TWO HUNDRED TIMES as much tax as the *rich man*; and that, in this case also, *the tax goes on increasing in weight as the taxed person becomes poor.*"

After showing that in the case of appraisements the *stamp duty* is made to be, in many cases, heavier on the *poor man*, by TWO-HUNDRED and FIFTY TIMES than it is on the *rich man*; and that, in the case of receipts, the duty is, in some cases, TEN TIMES heavier on the *poor man* than it is on the *rich man*, and

in other cases that it is TEN HUNDRED TIMES heavier; but that, with regard to *apprentices*, wherein the NOBILITY, CLERGY and LANDED GENTRY are not concerned, the stamp duty, where there are premiums given, goes on gradually and fairly from thirty pounds to a thousand pounds, a premium under thirty pounds paying one pound stamp, and a thousand pounds paying sixty pounds stamp; but, that while the *poor boys' parents* are thus taxed, the duties on settlements by the *rich*, pay only a TWENTY-FIVE SHILLING stamp on a *thousand pounds*; he concluded by moving the following resolution:—

“That this house will, with as little delay as possible, make such an alteration in the several acts, imposing duties on stamps and on sales at auctions, as shall cause the *Peers*, *Nobles*, *Baronets* and other *Great Landowners* to pay, in proportion to the amount of their property, as great an amount, in those duties, as is paid by the *fund-holders*, *annuitants*, *tradesmen*, *manufacturers*, *farmers*, *mechanics* and the rest of the industrious classes of the kingdom; and shall cause, in all cases, the *rich* to pay the said duties in the same proportion as the *poor*.”

This resolution could only get the support of twenty-six persons out of the *three hundred* members that were present. During Mr. Spring Rice's speech in opposition to the motion of Mr. Cobbett, he reproached that gentleman for not knowing that there was a bill already on the table (holding up a roll of papers tied up with red tape and declaring that that was the bill) to *revise* the stamp duties. MR. COBBETT did not dream that this was a *cool, premeditated, lie*! He could not believe that any *gentleman* could be found to commit so *degrading an act in the presence of three hundred persons*! Now, whether it were a lie, or not, we will not give an opinion; but, one thing is incontrovertible, namely, that it was not until *four days afterwards* that, Mr. Bernal, Lord Althorp and MR. SPRING RICE (!!!) were ordered to bring in a bill on the subject, and which bill went only to the repeal of the *Two-penny receipt stamp*: to repeal the duty of Stamps on advertisements, and, instead thereof, to fix a charge upon all advertisements in newspapers and periodicals of all kinds; and also that duties shall be paid on certain sea insurances, instead of those that had been hitherto paid on other insurances of the like kind in Great Britain and Ireland. Thus was the matter got over, and thus does it remain without any of its monstrous inequalities being smoothed down, and thus will it remain until the PEOPLE are represented in parliament; for until that time arrive, no man in his senses can reasonably hope that the *Lords* and other *great owners of estates*, who make all the *laws*, will voluntarily take upon themselves a fair share of the Stamp taxes, which amount annually to *seven millions*, exclusive of collection, and of the *Sorrows* house expense, besides law suits, informations, fines, Exchequer processes and all the other attendants, amounting, most probably, to another million! from all which we can have no reasonable grounds of hope of being freed while the *Debt* remains at its present amount, and to reduce that to its proper dimensions requires a very different set

of men to those who now exercise the rule over us; and, to have different men to rule, there must be a very different constituency; such a constituency as there would be if the constitution were faithfully adhered to, for, as judge *Blackstone* says, "upon the true theory and genuine principles of liberty, EVERY MEMBER of the COMMUNITY, however poor, should have a vote in electing those delegates, to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty and his life."

POOR LAWS FOR IRELAND.

ANOTHER of the prominent matters that have called the public attention since Mr. Cobbett's death, is the subject of Poor laws for Ireland. A great obstacle to the giving poor laws to the people of that country has been Mr. O'Connell's inexplicable objection to them. This objection existed in his mind many years ago, but, was removed by Mr. Cobbett, as described by himself at one of the meetings of the Catholic Association where he said.—"I know Mr. Cobbett, personally, and I am proud of it. He has convinced me of the necessity of establishing poor-laws for Ireland, though I have been of a different opinion." This conviction on the mind of Mr. O'CONNELL was soon obliterated. MR. COBBETT appears not to have made a very deep impression, or the nature of the stuff upon which he wrought was such as to allow of its being easily effaced; for we find him shortly afterwards saying "I cannot but start back with horror at the proposal of poor laws for Ireland. * * *

"I have thought upon this subject by day—I have mused upon it by night—it has been the last thought that visited my pillow before I closed my eyes to sleep—and it has had the benefit of my morning meditations; and the result to which I have come is this, that it would be impossible to introduce the poor-laws here without enslaving and degrading the poor. The poor themselves, I think, would suffer most from a poor law." What think you, readers, of a poor law being likely to "degrade" the poor of Ireland, where, according to a speech, made some years ago, in the House of Commons, by Colonel French, when speaking of the females in some of the rural districts, we were told that,—*"they are perfectly naked as to clothing, and perfectly helpless, without any convenience or comfort, or any possible way of gaining their livelihood; and unfortunately the gentry are so used to see that kind of distress that it does not shock them; they see people naked, and with nothing in the world but a blanket to sleep on, without a bed to lie on: and they are not aware that it is not the usual and proper way for them to exist, they are so used to see it"*?

What do you think of the possibility of a poor-law causing the "degradation" of the people whose state is thus portrayed by Mr. Cobbett; in his letters to one of his own labourers (CHARLES MARSHALL), he says:—"Having seen the people in the cities, I went, yesterday, to see them in the country; and

"I saw the state of both *labourers* and *farmers*. There was one village with about as many houses as there are in the village of *ASH*, about seventy or eighty perhaps, the scattered ones and all. The places, which I *call* houses, were, in general, from ten to twelve feet square; the walls made of rough stone and mud, whitened over, and about nine feet high; no ceiling; rough rafters covered with old rotten black thatch; in some a glass window the size of your hat, in two or four little panes; in others no window at all, but a hole, or two holes, in the wall, about a foot long, and four or five inches wide; the floor nothing but the *bare earth*; no chimney, but a hole at one end of the roof to let out the smoke, arising from a fire made against the wall of that end of this miserable shed; this hole is sometimes surrounded by a few stones put on that part of the roof a foot or two high; generally it is not, and in cold weather the poor, ragged, half-naked creatures *stop up the hole to keep in the smoke to keep them from perishing with cold!* * * * * One of these places costs

the landowner about *four pounds* to build it, and the poor creatures pay from *thirty shillings* to *two pounds* a year rent for them, without any garden, without an inch of land, without any place for even a *privy*, *WOMEN*, as well as men, must go to the *dung-heap* before the door, and the former are exposed to that which your wife, or any woman of Normandy, would die at the thought of! * * * * Every hole has a pig; the pig *eats with the family*; and generally sleeps in the same place. The potatoes are taken up and turned cut into a great dish, which dish is a shallow basket made of *osiers*, with the bark on. The family *squat* round this basket and take out the potatoes with their hands; the pig stands and is helped by some one, and sometimes he eats out of the pot. He goes in and out and about the hole like one of the family; the family sleep, huddled up together, on *dead weeds* or a little straw in one corner of the hole, and the pig, on a similar bed, in another corner. * * * * *

"The *farmer* and his family are all in half-nakedness or rags; their lot is little better than the mere labourers. *Potatoes* are their sole food. I wish the farmers of our parish could see one that I saw in the fine county of *KILKENNY*. His dress was a mere bundle of rags, tied round his body with a band of straw; his legs and feet bare, *no shirt*, and his head covered with a rag, such as you would rip out of the inside of an old cart-saddle. * * * Their wives have no hats, bonnets, or caps; but, in wet weather, have a *wad of straw* tied upon their heads! *MRS. WEST* and *MRS. FAGGOTTEN* and *MRS. HEATHORN* would look so nice, naked up to the knees, some rags tied round their middle, *no smock*, and their heads covered with a wad of straw! * * *

"In one street in the outskirts of the city of *Limerick* (which is made a *fine city* by the trade of sending away meat and butter and corn out of Ireland), I saw more misery than any man could have believed existed in the whole world. Men sleeping

“in the same wisp of dirty straw, or weeds, with their mothers, sisters, and aunts; and compelled to do this or perish; two or three families in one room, that is to say, a miserable hole, *ten feet, by eight or nine*; and husbands, wives, sons, daughters, all huddled together, paying sixpence, or eightpence or tenpence a week for the room; and the rent paid to a “*nobleman*” in England! Here I saw one woman with a baby in her arms, both *nearly naked*. The poor mother’s body was naked from the middle of the thighs downwards; and to hide her bosom, she caught up a dirty piece of old sack; she hung down her face (naturally very pretty); when she lifted it up, the tears were streaming down her cheeks. She had two other children quite naked, and covered up in some dirty hay, in one corner of the room! At a place in the country, I went to the dwelling of a widower, who is sixty years of age, and who has five children, all *very nearly stark naked*. The eldest girl, who is *fifteen years of age*, had on a sort of apron to hide the middle part of her body before; and *that was all she had*. She hid herself, as well as she could, behind, or at the end of, an old broken cupboard; and *she held up her two arms and hands to hide her breasts!*”

Such is the state of the poor wretches who labour upon the land in Ireland, and whom Mr. O’Connell thought it would enslave and degrade to put under the protection of poor-laws! What slavery and degradation mean, in Mr. O’Connell’s vocabulary, it is hard to say; but, if they mean something worse than this, then has the world never yet witnessed such things. Mr. O’Connell himself complained that *nine-tenths of the amount of the rent-rolls were spent out of Ireland*, and yet he objected to have overseers in the parishes to stop a part of the money and to cause it to be applied for the relief of the poor; although a great portion of such money is the produce of the tithes of Ireland, one-third part of which, he well knows, belongs to the poor by prescriptive and legal right, but which is coolly claimed and pocketed by wealthy persons who luxuriate upon it, either in England or on the Continent, whilst those whose right it is, and who till the land, are left in the state which has just been described, in which state they are to remain rather than receive their *own* portion of the tithes which are pocketed by the gentry and nobles of Ireland; amongst whom there is the EARL OF SHANNON, who takes the lay tithes of *eleven parishes*—The EARL OF CORK takes those of *seventeen parishes*—The DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE takes those of *twenty-six parishes*—and the MARQUIS OF DROGHEDA takes those of *twenty-eight parishes*, thus are the rights of the poor set at nought, and Mr. O’Connell objected to a poor-law, fearing, that, if that which belongs to the poor were restored to them, the *poor themselves would suffer most by the change!* How curiously constituted is the mind that could have given birth to such an opinion! But MR. O’CONNELL says that, “the destitute poor of Ireland, instead of being shut up in the gloomy poor-houses, may range their native mountains and vallies; where, shaded from the heat of the summer sun, by the beautiful foliage

"of the trees, and fanned by the balmy breeze of heaven, "they can repose themselves on the green carpet of nature "and listen to the ripple of the bubbling brook." This is not *verbatim*, as delivered by Mr. O'CONNELL as we quote from memory here, but *perfectly correct as to meaning*, and very nearly correct in its *wording*. Now let us have a *winter* version of this state of *freedom*; it would be something like this:—"The destitute poor of Ireland, instead of being "lodged in a comfortable poor-house (not a *bastile*), may "stretch their naked limbs on the frozen snow, with nothing to "shelter them from the 'pelting of the pitiless storm,' and from "the cutting of the keen and bitter blast, except the leafless "branches of the forest trees, whilst listening to the hail-storm "as it beats and rattles around them"!

Oh! Eloquence! "*intense*" eloquence, how fascinating art thou! that canst make those, who worship at thy shrine, forget, in the "*intensity*" of their adoration, the wailings of the wretched, the starvation and nakedness and misery of the poor! When shall we learn to despise thee, whenever thou showest thyself unaccompanied by *common sense* and *right feeling*, even as we despise the mere gaudy tinsel and frippery that decorate the clowns and jack-puddings of the stage?

We have known the time when whole parishes in Ireland have had "*extreme unction*" administered to them, owing to the dreadful sufferings caused by want of food! and Mr O'Connell thinks that poor-laws would degrade these poor creatures; he thinks that the *poor themselves, would suffer most by the change which poor-laws would produce!* Why, at that very time, money was being raised by *subscription*, in England, to be given as *charity* to the suffering people of Ireland (for which Mr. O'CONNELL has expressed great gratitude), and yet he thinks the receipt of *alms* less degrading than the receiving of poor's-rates, which are as much the property of the poor, as the estate of the rich man is his property. One would almost suspect that Mr. O'CONNELL has an "*itching palm*" for *alms*, seeing that he says that the receipt of that, which is really a *man's own*, would be more degrading to him than receiving *alms* (*rent*, we believe, is the modern name for the thing). Alas! poor naked and starving people of Ireland! when do you think you will be delivered from your state of deep degradation if the work be left to the performance of persons like Mr. O'CONNELL? who thinks that your living almost wholly on "lumpers," and on sea-weed is preferable to your being relieved by laws which make it imperative on your richer neighbours to take such means for the relief of your necessities as will secure you from pinching want and destitution?

Notwithstanding Mr. O'Connell's opposition to poor laws for Ireland, the parliament has acknowledged the necessity for them, and has passed a measure for granting relief to a *few* of the poor of that country. The Commissioners who were appointed to inquire into, and report upon, the necessity of poor laws for Ireland, according to the recommendation contained in the king's speech, delivered on opening the parliament in 1836,

re
of
to
sh
beg
pa
do
pas
aff
por
we
tho
tion
sall
a r
med
tres
befo
plic
the
a m
desti
of c
not
weal
perm
estat
bauc
upon
boile
nell's
are s
whic
rathe
seem
partic
both,
of po
pose,
existi
vents
we ar
his ha
from
him in
(thou
know
thousa
Childr
as the
fused
tail) fr
refused

recommended that poor houses should be built for the reception of the *helpless* poor, but that *no relief whatever* should be given to the able bodied, *under any circumstances*, and that a law should be passed making it *TRANSPORTATION if they were caught begging!!!* This horrible recommendation, even the "*reformed*" parliament had not the conscience to adopt, to the extent laid down by the commissioners, but they contented themselves with passing a law to cause poor-houses to be erected capable of affording shelter to *eighty thousand destitute persons*, while reports, then lying before the house, clearly showed that there were at that very time not less than two millions three hundred thousand persons in Ireland suffering the most horrible privations, many of whom were living on *one meal of potatoes, with salt-water*, in twenty-four hours, while others were dragging out a miserable existence upon *boiled sea-weeds!* Such is the remedial measure adopted by the parliament to remove the distresses of Ireland; such a miserable mockery never was made before of the distress of the poor! Instead of a measure applicable to the whole of Ireland, and as liberal as the Act of the 43rd of Elizabeth, there is a poor, paltry, partial law making a most niggardly provision for only *about one-thirtieth part of the destitute poor of Ireland*, and that is only afforded them in a state of complete seclusion from their friends and relatives. Why not pass a measure that shall compel the landowners, and other wealthy persons of Ireland, to support their poor, instead of permitting them to carry the whole of the produce of their estates out of the country, to be squandered in luxury and debauchery of every kind, whilst those who produce all, are fed upon spare and wretched messes of *lumpers and salt-water, and boiled sea weed*. Ah! but the representatives of Mr. O'Connell's *will*, and who are appropriately denominated his "*tail*," are sufficiently numerous to turn the scale against ministers on which side soever they are thrown, and therefore they, or rather their *master*, must be humoured at *all hazards*; and, seeing that he is opposed to poor laws, and that other powerful parties are in favour of poor laws, the ministers, truckling to both, manage things so as to cause the adoption of such a system of poor laws as, while it is wholly inefficient for any good purpose, is such as to leave nearly the same *quantity* of distress existing which serves the purpose of *agitators*, and thereby prevents that profitable profession from being broken up. This we are sure weighs not with Mr. O'CONNELL; although he has his *hand in every poor man's dish throughout Ireland*; it is not from any craving for *filthy lucre*, except as the means of assisting him in the *regeneration* of his country! No, no; the man who (though he is the *greatest boroughmonger* that ever lived) we know has proved himself so *virtuous* as to *refuse* a bribe of a *thousand pounds* for one solitary vote in the case of the *Factory Children*, and who *refused* Mr. RAPHAEL'S *two thousand pounds*, as the market price of one of his seats in parliament: who *refused* to be *sole legatees* to poor Ruthven (*late a joint of his tail*) for procuring him a seat in Parliament: and who invariably *refuses* to accept from his various "*joints*" sums of money that

are usually offered him, varying from *one to three thousand pounds*, for the privilege of occupying seats for his numerous "*rotten boroughs*." Such a man we may be sure is *incorruptible*, and therefore, *cannot* have been swayed in his opposition to poor-laws for Ireland by any *base* motive; but, then, we are puzzled *how* to account for it, as it appears wholly inexplicable; we will, therefore, leave the accounting for it to those philosophers who are fond of muddling and poking about in dark, deep and abstruse matters; and, for ourselves, we will be content to remain stout believers in his *political integrity*, notwithstanding our inability to produce clear and convincing reasons for our belief; and we will continue to watch and admire, and marvel at his rapid and tortuous pursuit of that *ignis fatuus*, of which no man knows the nature, but which *he*, himself, designates "*justice for Ireland*."

IRISH COERCION BILL.

THE IRISH COERCION BILL is a subject to which we will just allude now that we are contemplating Mr. O'Connell's policy. This bill was introduced to the house of Commons by the Ministry when Lord Grey was premier, and when Mr. COBBETT had a seat in that house. When the motion, "that this bill be read a third time," was put, MR. COBBETT rose and proposed the following resolution. "That this house, seeing in "this bill the substitution of Military Courts, for Courts consisting of Judges and Jurors—seeing in it the abrogation of all "the most precious institutions of the Country—seeing clearly "that its main purpose is to keep, in the hands of the present "Aristocracy, the plunder of the ancient church and the poor, "which the ancestors of that Aristocracy obtained by apostacy, "and which has been retained by the cruel penal laws and by "the shedding of innocent blood—and suspecting, moreover, "that this bill is intended as a prelude to the adoption of "similar measures in Great Britain, this house will read this "bill this day six months."

This stinging resolution was, of course, lost on a division; but we insert it here, because, first: MR. COBBETT did not think proper to publish it in his *Register*, and because we think it *too good* to be lost. Secondly, because it clearly defines the principle on which the Coercion-bill was founded.

MR. COBBETT was most ably supported by MR. O'CONNELL, who was very strenuous in his opposition to the bill that this resolution was intended to defeat; indeed, when the king's speech, which recommended coercion for Ireland, was debated in the house of Commons MR. O'CONNELL denounced that speech, in these words, "Oh! what will be the cry when this "brutal and bloody speech shall be read in Ireland?" And in a letter addressed to the Radicals of Hull, respecting the conduct of one of the members for that place, he says, "Mr. Hill approves "of the PRINCIPLE of the Irish Coercion-bill. Why, is he not more

"fit for the region of Algiers than of England, if this be his political opinion?" * * * Of a truth, it is the approver of such a PRINCIPLE who is suited to invent an atrocious charge against honest men." At Lambeth and at various other places has he often denounced the coercion bill as being, in its principle, a gross, unjustifiable and daring violation of the rights of the people of Ireland. All which is most true; but, it is also true that this atrocious measure increased Mr. O'CONNELL'S power over his countrymen a hundred fold; it doubled the number of the joints of his magnificent tail, and perhaps he thinks, that, if that cause (the coercion bill, for though it is not now the identical bill that the GREY ministry passed, its PRINCIPLE is the same) which has so greatly extended the length of his tail, be removed, a considerable docking may take place, which we can easily believe to be a most uncomfortable operation, and is therefore to be avoided at all risks. This we conceive may have been the reason why Mr. O'CONNELL, in 1837, looked upon the coercion of the people of Ireland as not being so "brutal and bloody" as it was in 1833, and that induced him, when Mr. SHARMAN CRAWFORD moved, in the House of Commons, for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Irish Coercion act, to say that "the Act is one for prevention and not for punishment. I am ready to take my share of the odium which might attach to the continuance of it, and I shall be sorry if the GOVERNMENT ACCEDE TO THE PROPOSITION OF THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR DUNDALK." The "government," accordingly, did NOT accede to the proposition, and the Coercion bill is the law of the land to this day, and Mr. O'Connell is still most actively and patriotically engaged in getting "justice for Ireland," in which he will succeed quite as soon as he wishes, and we most respectfully beg of him to believe that we trust, that he himself will finally receive his own FULL SHARE of that "justice." We will also just remind Mr. O'CONNELL and his "TAIL," for they seem to have forgotten it, but of which they ought to be reminded, especially as they so frequently fall back upon the threat, of a "repeal of the Union;" as if that would ruin England! as if that would make Englishmen fall into fits—as if England would be as much alarmed on that subject as a contented cornuto would be, on hearing his wife threaten that she would leave him and live entirely with her paramour! the facts, that we wish to remind these gentlemen of, are these, that it was an IRISH PARLIAMENT that passed all the horrible acts under which the Catholics lived so long; that Mr. GRATTAN drew up the "Sun-set and Sun-rise bill;" and that it was an IRISH CATHOLIC, of the name of DANIEL O'CONNELL, who drew up the bill for disfranchising the FORTY-SHILLING FREEHOLDERS OF IRELAND!

"CORN LAWS."

THE CORN LAWS are at this time exciting a great share of public attention, especially amongst the big manufacturers of the

NORTH, and a most horrible howling have they set up on account of the rise in the price of wheat ; forgetting, or choosing not to remember that their own produce has risen as well as that of the farmers, and that the main cause of the rise had been the quiet and gradual pushing into circulation of a large quantity of paper Money by the *Joint Stock Banks*, which has at length caused the prices to rise so high that the English manufacturers can get no profit on their foreign trade. They want to continue to supply the foreign markets with their goods, but cannot do so now, on account, as they say, of the dearth of provisions : and, to make provisions lower in price, these *honest* gentry wish for a *free trade in corn* so as to compel the English farmer to sell his *highly taxed* produce at as low a price as the foreigners can sell their *low taxed* produce. The *honesty*, the *fairness*, and the *liberality* of these ineffable villains were once compared by "GAFFER" GOOCH, in the House of Commons, to the unfairness, of compelling one of two men, in other respects equal, who were about to run a race, to carry a heavy load on his back. This is precisely the case with the manufacturers who clamour for the repeal of the corn-laws ; they wish the English farmers, who have a *distressing load* on their backs, to contend in a race with the *unloaded* foreigners, in order that they themselves may be able unjustly to secure an advantage from the result—they are the black-legs of the political turf. They well know that neither the farmer, nor themselves can gain a livelihood while the present amount of taxes continue to be raised, unless they be protected against the introduction of the produce of the comparatively untaxed foreigners, and they know, too, that the present amount of taxes is necessary, *until there be an "equitable adjustment" of the Debt*, and, yet, about this, none of these grasping gentry, the manufacturers, ever open their lips ; they only bawl about themselves being protected against the untaxed foreigner, and at the same moment bawl still more loudly *against* protection for the growers of corn, in order that they, the *protected* manufacturers, may eat cheap corn at the expense of the *unprotected* farmers ! precious scoundrels !

These wise and honest gentry seem to forget that the corn-laws are as necessary to the *treasury* (against whose graspings they never open their lips) as they are to the *corn-growers* and *land-owners* ; for, unless the produce of the land be high priced, how is sufficient money to find its way into the treasury to be given to the numerous swarms that live upon the taxes ? And how is the interest of the Debt to be paid if those who depend on the land (and they are nearly *fifteen twentieths* of the whole population) be not able to produce their various articles without a loss ? Come then, you hypocrites, or fools, or both ; you greedy and cormorant-like wretches, do a sensible act for once in your lives, and *join the Radicals* in endeavouring to get rid of the *debt* : reducing the army : cutting away all unmerited pensions and all sinecures, and then lower the taxes from about FIFTY MILLIONS a year to about TEN MILLIONS a year ; and never more will you have to complain of *corn-laws*, nor utter another word of complaint about *foreign competition*. But this we well know you

will *not* do, for you love the whole affair of debt, and funding, and paper money, and high taxes, which latter you will endeavour to avoid your own share of, although you partake so largely of the benefits of the funding and paper system, which will eventually, blessed be God, blow you all to the devil together!

But let us look a little more closely at this question of the repeal of the corn-laws.—

The *Manufacturers* want the *corn-laws* abolished in England, so that they may have bread as cheap as foreigners have it.

The *Corn-growers* want the *corn-laws* kept on, in order to enable them to keep up their prices.

The *manufacturers* are able to compete in *price* with foreigners by means of their superior *steam machinery*, which also enables them to beat down the price of labour, and thus, by giving very low wages, they become rich and their workmen poor, while the latter are forced to eat dear corn, owing to the corn laws and other heavy taxes. This makes the working people, as well as the masters, in the manufacturing districts, cry out for a repeal of the *Corn-Laws*.

The *Corn-growers*, not being able to invent any *machinery* to cause the production of *three or four wheat-harvests in one year*, cannot compete with foreigners in the price of wheat, because of the enormous amount of taxes that they have to pay, owing to the *one thousand millions of National debt*, and a consequently expensive government. Therefore the farmers wish for the corn-laws *not* to be repealed.

The machinery of the manufacturers, and the consequent beating down of the wages of their men, enable the master manufacturers to compete with the foreign markets, notwithstanding the national debt and the amount of taxation—while the farmers must have the protection of *corn-laws* to prevent Foreigners from sending their *untaxed* corn into the English market, to beat down their price; unless means be used to enable farmers in England to grow their corn as cheaply as the foreign farmers can: and the only means to do that effectually would be to ANNIHILATE THE ALL-DEVOURING DEBT, and bring the cost of government within reasonable limits. Will, therefore, those who cry out for the abolition of the *corn-laws*, recommend the sweeping away of the *debt*? If they will not they are either *knaves*, or *fools*; but whether the knavery or the folly preponderate is not so easy to determine, for the debt cannot be fairly tackled without such a reform in parliament as would give to every man a vote, and this the master Manufacturers will never consent to do, their pride being too great to allow of their consenting to their own workmen enjoying equal rights with themselves; so far their knavery and pride push them; and they cannot, for the lives of them, see the folly of thus withholding the franchise from the people, who may, by and bye, be induced to treat them as robbers, and either thrust them aside, or trample them down in the struggle for the possession of their political rights.

Whether the Corn laws be kept on, or taken off, is a question

to be settled between the "LORDS of the LAND," of the "LOOM" and of the FUNDS, and which we *Radicals* need care but little about, knowing that neither of the parties cares one pinch of snuff about *our* interest,—they are, and always have been, the real enemies of the working people, and of their freedom; and, therefore, as far as we are concerned, we say let the three monsters worry each other and fight it out, and in the mean time we may *step in and take our rights*, and thus put it out of the power of either of them ever to rob us again and treat us as mere beasts of burthen. Notwithstanding the reasons that may be adduced to prove that we may fold our arms and stand quiet spectators of the fight, we nevertheless will "*roll our tub*" in the general bustle, and be prepared to take our own rights which these three all-grasping parties have so long conspired to keep out of our possession.

We had written thus far when that excellent paper the "*Northern Liberator*," which treads exactly in the footsteps of the late Mr. COBBETT (and higher praise cannot be given to a paper,) was brought to us; in which we read as follows, "To those ignorant and senseless persons, who maintain that the corn-laws may be repealed and that wheat might be reduced to thirty-five or forty shillings a quarter, and yet the nation pay the fifty millions a year of taxes, we have not one word to say. Such men are worse than the beasts that perish; and it is a profanation of any thing like reason to address a single word to them. They are like Milton's devils, placed beyond the pale of hope. The whole matter lies in a nut-shell. If you have heavy taxes you must have dear corn; if you have dear corn the Cotton Lords cannot make their goods to sell, with a profit, to other countries which are comparatively not taxed at all. If artificial means with paper money be adopted to endeavour to make both prosperous, first revulsion and then convulsion must follow. One of these parties must, therefore, devour the other. We own we feel delight in the conflict. Our hearts thrill within us when we see the deep and bloody gashes, the ferocious encounters, and the death-like determination of the combatants. When one of them is destroyed the people may rejoice, for the day of their deliverance must then be near at hand."

The anti-corn-law thief makes no complaint of the fund holder receiving his interest in *gold* for a debt contracted in *paper*, and thus adding to the real amount of the taxes. He, tender soul! cannot bear the thought of touching the *funds*, they are one of the "*institutions of the Country*"—he cannot bear the thought of paying exactly what was *bargained for*, he must even go *beyond that*, and insist upon paying in *hard gold* the same nominal amount that was agreed to be paid in *paper*, fearing that he would, otherwise, violate "*national faith*," while he is at the same moment trying to take away the *interest* of the landlords, which is their *rent*, entirely!

Verily a most upright and honest desire! And to do the Land-Lords justice they are not behind the Cotton Lords in this stupid subserviency to the Fund Lords, who make their way to

"Loom"
but little
pinch of
been, the
om; and,
three mon-
mean time
out of the
eat us as
that may
and quiet
r tub" in
ghts which
d to keep

paper the
outsteps of
given to a
ows, "To
that the
reduced to
ation pay
ord to say.
nd it is a
ngle word
eyond the
l. If you
have dear
ell, with a
not taxed
adopted to
d then con-
therefore,
e conflict.
nd bloody
e determi-
destroyed
ance must

und holder
paper, and
nder soul!
re one of
thought of
go beyond
e nominal
g that he
is at the
landlords,

to do the
ards in this
eir way. to

their hearts by the soft blandishments of bits of paper, which they kindly furnish them, and thus cause that rise of prices that sets the Land Lords and the Cotton Lords at loggerheads, and which will, by and bye, destroy them both, unless the money monster itself be destroyed, and then, and not till then, will the people be delivered from these periodical struggles. It is something worse than madness to imagine that the country is to be relieved from its distress unless the fund-monster be destroyed; and it is sheer idiocy to suppose that the abolition of the corn-laws can tend to give relief; for that abolition would reduce the price of wheat to five shillings, or even four shillings a bushel, and *that*, as Mr. COBBETT has a hundred times said, is such a terrific devil that the government dare not face it! It would totally ruin both the Landlord and the farmer; and where the devil, then, is the poor *chancellor of the Exchequer* to get the malt-tax, the beer-tax, the hop-tax, the leather-tax, &c. ? Will he continue these taxes *then*, think you, my equally sagacious and honest Cotton Lords? and, if he do not continue these, what will be the amount of the income from the taxes on tea, coffee, sugar, spirits and wine? and then what is to become of the fundholders, the dead-weight, the swarms of pensioners male and female? Poh, it is all nonsense! The "*thing*" is so perfect in all its parts, there is in it such an exemplification of the "eternal fitness of things" that we are sure that it must remain very nearly as it is, or drop to pieces all at once; and then, if the deep resentment of the people, the robbed and insulted people, should cause the very frame of the government to be destroyed, it will be a consummation rather to be lamented than wondered at; and such as has been foretold a thousand times, and which foretelling has been received with sneering and contempt such as steel our bosoms against any feelings of sorrow for the victims, be their fate whatever it may.

It might be asked of us, if we, as *Radicals*, can be partial to the *Landlords* and *Farmers* as a body? We answer that we like them just as well as we do the *Cotton Lords*, and not a jot better; but, that it is merely from a love of *justice* and *fair play* that we defend them in this case: they have both proved themselves to be inveterate enemies of the working people, and, now that they have began quarrelling with each other, we would leave them to settle the matter as best they may, only that our innate sense of justice compels us to denounce the foul play of the *Cotton Lords*. Oh, no; we are not partial to the *Landlords* and "*Jolterheads*," nor ever shall be, until they heartily join us in the struggle for our rights; and we can assure them that, until the main body of the people have the power of sending members to parliament, they never will be secure in the possession of their lands, nor for any length of time will they get remunerating prices for the produce of their farms. We well remember all the efforts used by the "*Jolterheads*" to awe the reformers whenever they have been called upon to come forth. We well recollect seeing them at the very first political meeting that we ever attended; that meeting, so often alluded to by the late Mr. COBBETT, which was held on *Portsmouth-hill*, in Hamp-

shire, in 1817, where we saw the brave Yeomanry Cavalry, "*the body-guard of the boroughmongers*" as the late Major CARTWRIGHT used to call them, drawn up at the foot of the Hill, on their half-bred horses, with such bright swords, and fierce looks, and a bearing so altogether *en militaire*. We recollect them gallantly conspiring in 1820 at Meriden, to insist on the landlord of an Inn, in that place, turning Mr. COBBETT out of his house, although he was an invalid at the time, and was there for the benefit of his health; and we well recollect that the reason that the *gallant* rascals gave for their brutality was their "*hatred of the principles of COBBETT*."—We do not forget that, in their petitions for protection against foreign competition, they not only did not say a word against heavy taxation, but that they said they were willing "*to bear heavy taxes in the time of peace; the parliament would pass an act to raise and keep up the price of corn*."—We also recollect all their doings with regard to the *game*; how many men they have caused to be put to death for offences against those laws, passed entirely to secure to themselves the possession of "*WILD ANIMALS*."—We remember, too, and we hope *never to forget*, the passing of the most infamous measure that ever was called law in any part of the world, or in any age, namely, the damnable "*POOR-LAW AMENDMENT ACT*" which we have already alluded to: that act was passed expressly to "*save the estates*" of these very men from being *swallowed up*, and it had their almost universal support, for which we hope to live to see them duly rewarded; and we are greatly mistaken if that very law itself will not be the means of bringing upon them that reward; and, seeing that the *Cotton Lords* joined them in this cruel and murderous affair, we earnestly hope to see them participate in the punishment which it is so well calculated to produce.

Having thus stated our opinion of the Jolterheads we will resume the subject of the Corn-laws. It is, somehow or other, got into the heads of the anti-corn-law gentry, that England is altogether a *manufacturing country*; one twaddling, self-deluded, person, whose attention has been directed to this subject until his brain seems absolutely bewildered with the humming of the spinning-jenny, has compared the manufacturing part of the country to the town of Manchester, and the agricultural part of it to the *garden-pots* at the windows of that same Manchester! Now, to say one word to a gentleman who is *so far gone*, would be absolutely ridiculous, and, therefore, we will not do so; but, for the benefit of those who are not quite so deep in delusion, we would beg to tell them that the number of those (including their families) who work in the factories in Great Britain, amounts to but TWO MILLIONS FOUR HUNDRED THOUSAND persons, while the number of those who are employed on the land amounts to SIX MILLIONS THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND persons. Thus, out of a population of sixteen millions five hundred thousand persons, there are no less than six millions three hundred thousand whose living is derived immediately from the land, besides, at the very lowest computation, three millions five hundred

thousand of persons of the various trades, in the agricultural towns and villages, whose living is dependent on those who till the soil; a tolerably large "*garden-pot*" to give employment to so many persons! We would also remind them that the value of the capital employed in producing the fruits of the earth, that is to say the value of the "*garden-pot*" and the stock employed upon it, amounts to TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-ONE MILLIONS, SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIX THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED AND SEVENTY POUNDS, while the value of property in manufacture amounts to no more than two hundred and one million pounds. The annual return of the produce of the "*garden-pot*" is FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FOUR MILLIONS, TWENTY-NINE THOUSAND, SIX HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHT POUNDS, and the annual return of the produce of manufacture is TWO HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO MILLIONS, EIGHTY-FIVE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE POUNDS (according to the uncontradicted statement of Mr Macqueen). This is sufficient to show that the agricultural, or farming, part of the country is not quite such a small and contemptible thing as the manufacturers, mounted on the backs of those supreme asses the *doctrinaires* and the sublime philosophers of the transcendental-school, would have us believe. There is another thing to be observed here, too, and that is, that those grasping villains of manufacturers, who call out so lustily for a repeal of the Corn-laws, are getting, on their capital, a profit of one hundred and twenty per cent. while the profit on the capital of the Landowners and Farmers amounts to but little more than three per cent.! and these are the men who have the unconscionable insolence to wish to lower the price of the produce of the land wholly at the cost of the owners and occupiers, in order that they and their work-people may eat *cheap bread*! And for what purpose is it that they want to have cheap food? Why, to enable them to manufacture their goods cheaper than foreigners can manufacture them. But, how would cheap food enable them to do that? Why the moment that, say, twenty per cent., is taken off the price of the food that their work-people consume, they would, most likely, take off forty or fifty per cent. from the pay that they now give them, and this they would be the better able to do by the ruin, which the repeal of the Corn law would bring amongst those who labour on the land, driving the unemployed labourers from the *fields to the factories*, and causing such a "*surplus population*" in the manufacturing towns as would be sure to perpetuate the misery thus brought upon the present race of manufacturing labourers by their grasping and grinding employers. We hope that the honest hardworking chaps in the manufacturing districts will think on this matter, and they will then clearly perceive that it is not to their interest to have cheap corn, unless that cheapness be brought about by a reduction of taxation. By way of parenthesis we would here ask, why the English manufacturers should care so much about the *foreign* market, and seem to disregard the *English* market? They must know, if they have paid any attention to the matter; that compared with the home trade, the *foreign trade is a mere*

trifle! that nearly fourteen-sixteenths of all the goods manufactured in the kingdom is sold for the *home consumption*. They appear to be influenced by a desire to destroy their best customers; to cherish the foreigners who purchase about two-sixteenths of the goods manufactured by them, and to cripple the means of those who purchase the remaining fourteen-sixteenths!!!

There was a howl set up on the repeal of the Corn Law in 1825 which was thus replied to by the late Mr. COBBETT who so well understood the subject:—

"The petitioners, like a great many other people that do not very well understand what they are about, begin at the wrong end. There is something else to be done before you invite foreigners to bring corn into the country. What man in his senses would not try first to cause corn to be raised in England sufficient to be sold at a reasonable price, before he endeavoured to cause it to be brought from abroad? Can these petitioners doubt that it would be better for us to eat English wheat at four shillings a bushel, than French wheat, or Polish wheat, or Dutch wheat, at four shillings a bushel? Well, then, take off the taxes that load the land. Take off the malt-tax, the soap-tax, the candle-tax, the tax on all the implements of husbandry. Take off this immense load; enable the labourer to live upon his wages by paying more of his money for food and drink, and less of it into the hands of the tax gatherer; take the labourer thus from the poor-house, or from the poor-book, and English farmers will gladly sell you their wheat at four shillings a bushel; the petitioners should begin by praying for a removal of these taxes; and they should end by praying for a total abolition of the Corn Laws; or they should begin by praying for a due and full execution of Peel's bill, and then the Corn-laws would become nearly a dead letter, as they were in 1822.

"Oh! exclaims some furious rag-man: What! you want, like a true Jacobin as you are, to *destroy the foundations of our prosperity and of our greatness!* Yes, I do, indeed; and if the petitioners against the *Corn-bill* do not also wish to destroy the foundations of your prosperity and your greatness, they would act a much wiser part to let the thing remain quietly as it is. It is a very ticklish thing; it rests upon very thin bits of dirty paper, such as no pen but a butcher's can make a mark upon. It is a thing to be let alone; not to be stirred up, rummaged and canvassed."

Thus it is clear that, if you take off the taxes, the farmers will be able to grow their wheat as cheaply as foreigners can: they will be able to pay their rent to their landlords, the tithe to the parsons (thus preserving to us the enjoyment of the "*blessed comforts of our holy religion*"), and we shall see an end put to the fightings that so often arise between them and the manufacturers; but it must be such a reduction as will destroy the "*DEBT,*" *par excellence*; the *Waterloo-debt*, or dead weight: the *standing army* in time of peace; it must be such a reduction as will not keep fastened upon our backs three or four

hur
a r
nur
duc
ma
san
am
and
dep
tha
bro
who
the
thir
Wa
mor
gove
pen
ena
can
pect
enur
duc
a R
thes
their

A
more
form
exist
care
wou
alon
prot
and
more
(a th
cern
that
polit
disre
land

THE
domi
for se
have
habiti
prem

hundred Generals and a corresponding number of Admirals; a reduction that will relieve us from a swarm of pensioners as numerous as the locusts that plagued the Egyptians; which reduction no sane man expects to see effected by a parliament, a majority of whom are returned by one hundred and fifty thousand electors; by a parliament that can boast of having amongst them one hundred and sixty-seven officers of the Army and Navy, and not less than fifty-one placemen, all of whom are dependent upon the taxes for their daily food! by a parliament that is graced by the presence of one hundred of the sons, brothers and other relations of the peers; of those very peers who, with their families, have places and pensions amongst them amounting to more than the whole of the poor's-rates of *thirty-eight*, out of the fifty-two, counties of England and Wales! or, in other words, who have amongst them, *annually*, more by five hundred thousand pounds, than the *whole of the government taxes* of Scotland and Wales! which places and pensions must be abolished altogether if the English Farmer be enabled to sell his produce as cheaply as the foreign farmer can; which, we again say, is a reduction that no *sane* man expects to see, while there exists all these causes that we have enumerated, and that must, of necessity, be opposed to any reduction; and these opposing causes will not be removed but by a Radical Reform in the House of Commons; a thing that all these parties dread as much as, for the weight and number of their sins, they ought to dread the day of judgment!

All these things make us see clearly that the Corn laws are more requisite for the government than for the farmers, for the former, wholly composed as it is of tax-eaters, could not be in existence but for the taxes, which attract them just as a putrid carcass attracts the kites and the ravens; whereas the farmers would be benefitted by the destruction of taxation, and by that alone; for nothing else, that human ingenuity can devise, can protect them against the violent struggles of the cotton-people and the Fund people, which struggles will become more and more violent and deadly until the contest will end in a *panic* (a thing at no great distance) which will shake the whole concern to pieces; one of the great blessings of which would be that we should hear no more of the senseless prating of the political economists, nor witness any more of the violent and disreputable struggles between the productive classes of the land and the loom!

CANADIAN REBELLION.

THE subject of the revolt of the Canadians against the "*baleful domination*" of this government, has occupied the public mind for some time past. And although our Whig rulers would fain have us believe that the outbreak was occasioned by the *habitans*, or French inhabitants, endeavouring to gain the supremacy over the English settlers, we were not so blind as not

to see that far different causes were at work to induce the inhabitants, both French and English, to attempt to throw off the galling yoke that our *liberal* government seemed determined to rivet around their necks.

The short history of the matter is this:—In 1791, or 1792 (for we speak merely from recollection) a Charter was granted by England to Canada, by which the Sovereign of England was recognized as *Governor*, and who, of course, had a *Lieutenant Governor* to act for him.—This Charter also gave them a *Legislative Council*, or House of Lords; and a *Legislative Assembly*, or House of Commons; there was, in addition to these, an *Executive Council*, somewhat like the *ministry*, or, rather, the *Privy Council* of this country, whose duty it was to assist the *Lieutenant Governor* with their advice. Thus there were a *Governor*:—a *Lieutenant Governor*:—an *Executive Council*:—a *Legislative Council*, and a *Legislative Assembly*. The Legislative Assembly, or House of Commons, was chosen by those of the people who were freeholders; and, like its prototype in England, it had the power of voting, or withholding the supplies, as no money could be paid without its consent. The larger portion of the inhabitants are of French origin and of course they are fairly represented in the *Legislative Assembly*; but, as the country is a British Colony, the *Lieutenant Governor* is British; and nearly every man composing the *Legislative Council*, or House of Lords, and the *Executive (or Privy) Council*, is British. Thus there are two Houses, or Chambers, besides the *Lieutenant Governor*, to oppose the representatives of the people; and, in addition to these, there are the favourites both of the colonial government, and of the government in England, (comprising legitimate, and illegitimate, sprigs of nobility, for whose special benefit all the colonies are kept) to receive all the appointments to offices of various sorts, and to share in jobbing and speculation of all kinds, for which good things the colonies have been so long proverbial. These things very naturally gave great umbrage to the French portion (who are the most numerous) of the inhabitants, who are completely shut out from offices and places of emolument of every kind, according to the usual and approved method of the English government in all such cases, who always treat the people over whom they rule, as if they were created merely to minister to their comfort and convenience, and therefore must be subject to the most capricious and unjust treatment if it tend to increase the wealth and power of those their rulers.

To put a stop to those grievances, the people of Canada, backed by their Legislative Assembly, finding that they could produce no effect on the Legislative Council, began in 1820, to send petitions to the British Parliament, complaining of their grievances. This they continued to do, without any notice being taken of them, until the Session of 1828, when a committee was appointed to inquire into their complaints, which committee reported that they were *well founded*; but, nothing was done to redress them. They now began to see the necessity there was for an amendment in their Constitution, and

they accordingly prayed for such a change as would give them an *Elective* Council instead of such an one as they then had, which was the mere nomination of the government. They continued petitioning for this, until the year 1833 without any more attention being paid to them than if they had been so many jack-asses ! This, as we can easily imagine, caused great discontent ; but, if a government can treat those who are living around them with supercilious contempt of their prayers, we cannot expect that a distant colony will have much better treatment at their hands ; and thus it invariably happened to the Canadians whenever they petitioned the British Parliament. In 1833 the Legislative Assembly, tired of petitioning and impatient of the continual thwarting which they received from the Legislative Council, resolved, at length, to withhold the supplies from which the means of paying the Judges and other functionaries were derived. This, after a time, caused much consternation amongst the officials of various sorts, and made them, in their turn, complain very loudly ; their complainings were soon heard in England, and in 1835 a Commission, with Lord Gosford at its head, was sent out to *inquire* into the complaints ; but this was soon denounced by the Legislative Assembly as an unconstitutional interference, and nothing whatever was done to allay the discontent. In the session of 1837 a number of resolutions were proposed by Ministers in the House of Commons, refusing the demands of the Legislative Assembly for the forming of an *Elective* Council, and empowering the Colonial government to seize on the money in the Canadian Exchequer, without the sanction of the Legislative Assembly, and in violation of the Constitution, and out of it to pay the Judges, and other public Officers, their arrears. This caused great indignation in the Legislative Assembly, and amongst the people of Canada ; who immediately determined to prevent a continuance of these violations of their rights even by force of arms. They accordingly had recourse to training, to acquire a knowledge of the use of arms, in order to be able to resist, by "*physical force*," any attempt to carry into effect the resolutions, thus passed in the British legislature, openly violating their constitution. Another means, too, they used to assist in the same cause, namely "*moral force*," (a very good thing if well seconded and backed by *physical force*, but, without *that*, not of half the value of *one single rifle-ball*.) This moral force was to prevent any money being collected to be sent to replenish the coffers of the treasury. These coffers were filled principally from a duty levied on Brandy and rum ; the former bore a duty of one shilling a gallon, and the latter one shilling and sixpence a gallon. These spirits the people now resolved to discontinue the use of, and in their stead they drank whiskey and beer ; and as there was an income derived from the duty on *tea*, they ceased using that, and, instead of it, they made a beverage from *roasted barley*, *beans*, or *bread crust*, and *maple-sugar*. This exhibition of *moral force*, so backed up by *physical force*, soon taught the English Government that, unless great "*vigour*," as Old Grey used to say, were used, Canada was lost to us !

Vigour was consequently had recourse to, and for the last two years there has been open revolt, with continual fightings going on, and in addition to these fightings, the English army has been performing in the character of "SWING," throughout the whole contest; just as it acted in the last American war, earning for itself the unenviable character of being (if not the most barbarous, cold-blooded and atrocious band of mercenaries that ever disgraced the world) certainly not the most feeling, generous and high-minded of men.

Lord John Russell has stated in the House of Commons, that the insurrection was wholly confined to the *Habitans*, or French part of the inhabitants of Lower Canada; but, he added, if a similar feeling should manifest itself in the other North American provinces, he should hesitate as to the line of conduct that the Government ought to pursue. But, since that declaration, *Upper Canada* has revolted (and even *Newfoundland* has, owing to the oppressions inflicted upon her, stopped the supplies:—The *New Brunswick* House of Assembly has shown its opposition to the government—And the House of Assembly of *Prince Edward's Island* has even adopted the very identical declaration of grievances that M. Papineau moved in the Legislative assembly of *Lower Canada*); and how does this square with my Lord John's Declaration that it was only the *habitans* that were discontented? Out of a population of six hundred thousand in *Lower Canada*, four hundred and fifty thousand or three-fourths, are French, but in the lists of persons engaged in the rebellion, and that have been published, we find that there are as many English, Irish and Scotch names as there are French names, which shows clearly enough that it is not a *French* outbreak any more than it is an *English* one. In *Upper Canada* the population is four hundred thousand almost entirely British and Irish. Is this revolt in *Upper Canada*, then, a *French affair* too, my Lord? Poh! Poh! no one knows better than Lord John Russell, that it is a struggle on the part of the people of these Colonies to throw off the "*baleful domination*" of the tyrannical British Government, and throw it off they will as surely as did the United States, and as surely as they are within Gun-shot of the United States, which afford such a convenient retreat for the hundreds upon hundreds of deserters from the British army, that has been sent to Canada to put down the rebellion; many of whom, it is well known, enlisted into that army for the sole purpose of getting a *free passage to the United States*; where, they well knew, they could manage to provide themselves with those comforts that the "*thing*," as our friend Cobbett used to call it, prevented their enjoying at home.

This state of things not being likely to terminate, the Whig Government sent out Lord Durham, armed with the most despotic power, even to the extent of permitting him to entirely suspend the constitution: and to the establishing a military despotism of the most arbitrary kind: to the substituting courts martial for the trial of civil offenders, instead of the trial by jury in the regular courts of law. This power he exercised in the most reckless manner, and carried it so far as to banish

people without even the form of a trial of any kind; but, all was of no avail in the putting an end to the rebellion, seeing that nothing was done to remove the original cause of the discontent that had induced the people to fly to the use of arms against their oppressors.

The arbitrary conduct of *Lord Durham* was arraigned by many members of the Parliament at home, and even the Whig ministers, who had caused this unconstitutional power to be lodged in his hands, did not attempt to defend him! Proving to all the world, that, which all close observers of their conduct had long known, that they had induced him to accept the disgraceful office merely to *get rid of him from the neighbourhood of the Court*, he being likely to stand in the way of this dirty, mean, shabby and tricky crew, in their violent efforts to retain their places and pocket their pay; and having, on account of the danger to those their dearest desires, succeeded in removing him out of the country and into an odious service, they were glad of any means to ruin his reputation so as to render him powerless whenever he should return. This, the poor, inane, but ludicrously proud, lordling, discovered too late; and, like a disappointed child, he immediately threw up his *Lord High Commissionership* in a pet: left Canada, in a state of greater turmoil than he found it, and came away amidst the jeers of the people; and, on reaching England, endeavoured to cause meetings of *condolence* to be held so as to heal his wounded spirit and to enable him to put a good face on the matter and hold up his head once more! But, alas! all would not do; the malignant and intriguing ministry, who had induced him to get into the dirty mess, finding that he had stumbled, instead of lending him a helping hand, absolutely rolled him over in the filth and left him to scramble out as he best could:—

“Slow rose his form in majesty of mud!”

and, since that sad mishap, he has been wandering about, in the hope of rubbing off some of the slime, amidst crowds of decent persons, who, on their part, avoid coming in contact with him as they would avoid the pestilence, and leave him, in solitude, to bemoan his fallen greatness.

To return to Canada:—The same determined resistance to the British domination has continued to be manifested by the people; and the same determination to maintain or restore the same state of things that caused the rebellion, is shown by the Government party; and this horrible state of things is constantly bringing both parties into collision, with alternate success and defeat; but still the “*rebels*” are by no means put down, nor are they likely to be; they have, indeed, declared their independence of this country, and will now doubtless achieve that independence at the point of the bayonet, and compel their tyrant oppressors to acknowledge it. And that is a thing that the people of this country ought to desire, viewing it merely as a matter of *pounds, shillings and pence*, and leaving out of their view all considerations about the love of freedom and the hatred of oppression that ought to animate them; for what is

the cost of Canada to this country? Why SIR HENRY PARNELL tells us that, on that country, *fifty, or sixty millions* have been expended by England already, and that she is an annual charge of *six hundred thousand pounds*; besides which, there is a plan of fortification there, which has been in progress for several years, which will cost about *three millions of money*, and which she will use against us to help her shake off the " *baleful domination.*" Will the reader exclaim against the want of gratitude in the people of Canada in having thus rebelled against those who have so lavished their riches on them? Oh, no! the reader will not do that: he will be sure to bear in mind that this money goes to reward those who hold power in Canada, and these fortifications and fortresses are for the accommodation of gay and glittering officers and soldiers sent out from England to keep Canada in subjection, as a *Colony*, where the Nobility, and wealthy and powerful persons of England may send their younger sons and bastards (as to a *Foundling hospital*) so that they may be kept at the national charge—that is to say, they are sent abroad, to be out of the sight of the people of England, so that there might be a supposition here, that they are usefully employed, and thus cause the money to be given ungrudgingly, while they are doing no earthly thing, except kindly consuming our earnings, and swaggering over the people whose country is so unfortunate as to be infested with their presence. There is, then, no proof of a want of *gratitude* on the part of the Canadians in this their *rebellion*; nor is there any reason why the certainty of the final success of the *rebels* should cause the people of England to die of grief!

It ought also to be noticed that the inhabitants of the United States, deeply sympathizing in the wrongs and insults under which the Canadians have so long suffered, render them all the aid in their power, not only by supplying them with *arms*, but by going *in person* and fighting side by side with them! The President of the United States uses all the means that the Constitution has armed him with, to stop the people of that country from fighting in the ranks of the rebels ("*Patriots*" we believe is the word usually employed to designate them, but "*rebels*" is the more proper word, for their rising is a *rebellion* against tyranny, and there is nothing disgraceful in being a "*rebel*" in such a case), and from rendering them any aid whatsoever. This he does by the means of *proclamations*, warning them under pain of suffering the punishment that the law awards to persons found fighting against a country with which their own country is at peace; but these proclamations do not prevent the American people from still lending all the assistance in their power to the Canadians. This excites the patriotic indignation of the *Times* newspaper, which says, that, "if the Government of the United States is not able to keep its "people from violating the laws of nations by invading our "Canadian possessions, *we ought to do it for them.*" That is very just; but, no one knows better than the *Times*, that, that is exactly what England *cannot* do if she would; unless she could support an *addition to her annual expenditure, of some twenty or*

HENRY PAR-
 lions have
 an annual
 there is a
 progress for
 money, and
 e "baleful"
 want of
 ed against
 h, no! the
 mind that
 n Canada,
 mmodation
 n England
 Nobility,
 send their
 U) so that
 o say, they
 f England,
 re usefully
 grudgingly,
 consuming
 country is
 There is,
 Canadians
 e certainty
 e people of

 the United
 ults under
 them all the
 h arms, but
 em! The
 is that the
 ple of that
 patriots" we
 them, but
 s a rebellion
 in being a
 em any aid
 oclamations,
 nt that the
 country with
 oclamations
 ing all the
 excites the
 h says, that,
 e to keep its
 vading our
 ." That is
 that, that is
 ss she could
 ne twenty or

thirty millions of pounds sterling, which could not be done without returning to small paper-money, and that would speedily bring us back to that state of things from which our sapient governors have so often told us we were delivered for ever. But, *why* should the President (supposing him to have the power), prevent the Yankees from assisting the Canadians? The English government did not prevent COLONEL EVANS and his "Legion" of Englishmen from assisting the "*rebels*" in Spain, (for the Queen's party there are real "*rebels*," they being engaged in openly supporting her in her attempt to retain the throne for her daughter, in opposition to, and in direct defiance of, the Spanish *Constitution*, which directs the *Salique* law to regulate the succession to the throne, which law, as every body knows, says that a *woman* shall not reign over that country where such law exists) the English government, so far from interfering with COLONEL EVANS and his "*legion*," publicly and openly abetted them in the enterprise; and, still more, they rewarded the Colonel, for his services in this pretty affair, by investing him with the order of *knighthood*, on his return to this country! And is the government that has acted thus, to *compel* the people of the United States to refrain from assisting the Canadians in their rebellion against such a *kind* and *paternal* government as that which has so long ruled over them? It is useless to complain either of the interference of the people of the United States, or of the supineness of the Government there, in not preventing that interference, as we must be certain that the people who sympathize with the oppressed Canadians will lend them a helping hand; and we must, also, be certain that, although the Government of the United States will not *openly* interfere in favour of the Canadians, that government must secretly rejoice in the difficulty that such rebellion brings upon such a government as ours: they must see that the affair will cost England nearly as much as a war, while it lasts, and that it weakens England, whilst it must ultimately add strength to America. One of the reasons why it would be injurious to England to have the government of the Canadas *forcibly wrested from her*, is this, the people there would always look upon the English as *baffled* and *beaten tyrants*, and would prefer the friendship and alliance of the United States to an union, even upon an *equality*, with this Country. Why not give up the contest then at once? Because you then destroy those things for which it is now forcibly kept; you cut off an outlet to the *English* Lieutenant Governors;—*English* Legislative Council: *English* Executive Council: *English* Judges, *English* placemen of all sorts, and an English army, which affords so many of the sons, brothers and bastards of those belonging to the "*thing*" at home, the opportunity of *serving their Country*. Are these things to be put an end to merely to stop the killings that are going on in Canada? What are those *killings*, compared to the taking *place and pay* from these worthies? Why *that* would be *robbery* and *murder* too! the thought of which would be more distressing to their benevolent and feeling hearts than all the *swing fires* of the British army: than the setting on fire, and tumbling

over the Niagara, of all the vessels, and the killing of nineteen-twentieths of the men women and children of the whole colony ! It would be *wise* if the independence of the Canadas were accorded immediately, for to suppose, that, with the republic of America within gun-shot of them, and with the cause of their present excitement left rankling in their minds, and considering that they have taken the first step against this government and gone so far as to declare their independence, to suppose that, with all these reasons against any reconciliation, the Canadas will ever be peaceable under the English yoke, is to wilfully blind ourselves to all experience—to be self-deluders, and to deny all that history declares, or that reason points out.

Our sapient government would do well to inquire whether this affair might not eventually embroil us with the United States: and whether they think that we, who really *cannot support a peace*, can afford to go to war, especially with a country like America? A war which would require, as we have already said, an addition of twenty millions, or even thirty millions, a-year to our taxation; which would immediately cause the re-issuing of *small paper money*, which would cause the disappearance of all the gold from our *circulation*; and which would place our government in that wretched state of degradation that they were in before the currency measures of 1819; that state which left them to the mercy of any person, foreigner or native, of *blowing up* the whole system of funding, of paper, and of, most probably, destroying the government itself. If we were, or rather *they* were, for the mass of the people need not care two straws about it, except, perhaps, that they may in the end gain by it, to be again brought back to this *delightful* state of *national greatness*, would they endeavour to prevent a "*puff-out*," as Mr. Cobbett used to call it, by employing *engravers of inimitable* bank notes? And, if so, would they send to America for those engravers as they did before? Another thing for their consideration is this—seeing that a war would make paper-money necessary, and seeing, too, that paper-money would rob every working man of nearly half his present miserable wages; would they, seeing that these must be the consequences, ever put the working people of England into this wretched plight. Or would any set of men, calling themselves the *government*, be bold enough to venture on a war while the *abominable new poor-law is in existence*? You would, perhaps, put your dependence in a *rural police* composed of *Irishmen*, that the greatest public scoundrel that ever lived, has offered to send you! What use would they be against the forgeries of your paper money that would take place in America, to a *certainity*, and be strewn about the streets of a few of the principal cities and towns in England (which, by the bye, would ruin, at a blow, all those poor deluded fools, who have deposited their hard earnings in the savings' banks). Unless you have some contrivance to prevent this, you are as weak and powerless as a litter of blind puppies, and as completely at the mercy of your enemies as if you were bound hand and foot at their feet! That is as well known, not only in America, but in every nation

in Europe, as it is to yourselves; and the proof, that it is well known to yourselves, is the fact of your patient forbearance under insults innumerable that you have received from every one of those nations; thus showing that all your *pluck* is gone—that you have lost all real power, and instead of being either feared, or respected, you only inspire contempt and scorn.

REFORM IN PARLIAMENT.

THE next subject, on which we shall make a few remarks, is that of a Reform in the Commons' House of Parliament. This subject has for a long time excited very great interest throughout England, Scotland, and Wales; and doubtless would excite an equal degree of interest in *Ireland*, were it not for the great influence of a man, who is as great an enemy to reform as ever lived, and who is doing all he possibly can to keep the Irish people in bondage, but whose influence is derived solely from his vehement expressions of the sincerity of his desires for the welfare of that people, who have given implicit belief to every word that he has uttered about his *sincerity* in their cause, and who have yielded up to his guidance the whole of their political affairs, even to the extent of permitting him, in all public matters, to think for them, until he has acquired an influence over them perhaps as great as any man ever acquired over a people; a fearful state of things for a people, even when their confidence is bestowed on a *good man*; but dangerous in the extreme when it is blindly bestowed on perhaps the most unprincipled and profligate man in Ireland! Such being the state of things there, we lose the exertions of the people of that country in the cause of reform, seeing that they have bound themselves to the supporting any thing, or every thing, that O'Connell, in the pursuit of his darling object, *money*, might think fit to declare necessary. We must, therefore not calculate upon any aid from that quarter, but put our own shoulders to the wheel, and by our exertions we may by and bye arouse the attention of that ill used and humbugged people and gain their assistance.

The Reform that has been the subject of so many hundreds of public meetings within the last twelve months, is that of

Universal Suffrage.

Vote by Ballot.

Annual Parliaments.

Payment of Members.

No Property Qualification for Members.

On these subjects we shall make some remarks taking them separately and in the order in which they are here placed.

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE.

WE shall endeavour to show that every man, who is of mature age, of sound mind, and unstained by indelible crime

ought to possess the elective franchise. And then we shall show, that, according to the *ancient practice*, the SUFFRAGE WAS UNIVERSAL: that the people have been robbed of the power to exercise it, and that, therefore, it is right for the people to demand the restoration of that power from those who keep it from them; and, in case they refuse to yield it up peaceably, that it is a duty they owe to themselves and to posterity to TAKE IT.

PAINE has this beautiful passage on this subject, "Every man has a right to one vote, and no more, in the choosing of his representatives, it appertains to him in right of his existence, and his person is his title deed." But the practice, the unjust and infamous practice is, that no person who does not pay the taxes and who does not possess visible property to a certain amount, shall exercise the elective franchise. "*The Commonwealth of England*," a work written in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Sir Thomas Smith, says "*Every Englishman is intended to be present in Parliament, either in person, or by procurator and attorney, of what pre-eminence, state, or quality soever he may be, from the Prince to the lowest person in England;*" and Blackstone declares that, according to the English constitution, "NO SUBJECT OF ENGLAND can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes, *even for the defence of the realm, or the support of the government*, but such as are imposed by his own consent, or that of his representatives in "Parliament". Well, then, does not the labouring man pay taxes upon every thing that he eats, drinks and wears, and upon every one of the implements of his trade? Why should the man who pays *direct taxes* be considered a tax-payer any more than he who pays *indirectly*? He who pays *direct taxes*, does, in fact, only pay them for the man who has to hand them over to him in the prices of the goods that the direct payer sells, to the consumer of those taxed articles; and, therefore, the consumer is the real tax payer, only that he hands the amount of his share of the taxes to the tax gatherer, through the person from whom he buys the various articles that he requires. It is useless to multiply arguments on this point for no man is so brutally stupid as not to see that the labouring man, not only is a tax-payer, but that, in proportion to his means, he is compelled to pay infinitely more tax than the wealthy man. And as regards the possession of property the working man has his LABOUR; which, not only is *property*, but, is the *foundation of all property*, and this *property* is that which is taxed to nearly the amount of seventy-five per cent. as has been so clearly shown by Mr. PRESTON the Chancery Barrister and late an M.P. and also by the late Mr. COBBETT. How often has the latter gentleman, in advocating the rights of the labouring man, dwelt upon this species of property and proved the real superiority of it, to that of the mere dog-kennel of a house of forty shillings a year. Enough on the subject of labourers being payers of taxes and real owners of property. Now what says *Blackstone* on the subject of the franchise being extended to these men. He, who, we ought not to forget, was a *Tory*, and pretty much of a courtier, says, in the first Book of his *Com-*

mentaries, chapter 2d. "If it were probable that every man would give his vote freely and without influence of any kind" (Blackstone did not think about the *ballot*), then, upon the true theory and genuine principles of liberty, every member of the community, *however poor*, should have a vote in electing those delegates to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty and his life." And, again, he says "In a free state, every man, who is supposed a free agent, ought to be, in some measure, his own governor; and, therefore, a branch, at least, of the legislative power should *reside in the whole body of the people*." Mr. CORBETT has also so well and so wisely given his opinion on this subject, that it would savour of the most contemptible affectation, or dirty plagiarism, were we to attempt to give our own reasons in support of it, in preference to those of such a man. He says at Vol. 70 of his Register. Page 559. "But upon what *principle*, upon what show of reason or of justice, are you to call upon a man to come out and serve in the militia; to come forth in the defence of his country and of the laws; to assume the military garb, to submit to military discipline, to be punished for desertion or disobedience of orders; upon what *principle* are you to call a man forth, compel him to quit his aged parents, his wife and his children, and to risk his life, when, but the day before, you have refused to let him vote at an election upon the ground that he has *no stake* in the country? This is monstrous impudence; the bare thought must fill every young man with indignation! He is old enough and wise enough to *fight for your stake* in the country; but too young and too thoughtless to be deemed to *have a stake himself* to be fought for. If you will have it to be *property*, every man has a *property in his labour*, which is the basis of *property*. What! is a house, the rent of which is fifty shillings a year, to give a man a right to vote, and is the ploughman, for instance, who has seven or eight pounds a year of *wages*, over and above his keep, not to have a vote? In short, every objection to this universal suffrage is so full of absurdities; it is so repulsive to reason, and so offensive to the conscious worth of man, that it can never be sustained except by a tyranny that can be supported by the sword. One objection that has been stated to universal suffrage is this; that, if labourers and journeymen were left to choose the representatives in parliament, they, being the greatest number would choose men of their own description; would choose ploughmen and shoemakers and tinkers and the like. They who urge this objection by no means believe what they say: they know that when poor men are going to law, they do not employ miserable *pettifoggers* if they can avoid it; these objectors know, that, when a poor man breaks his leg, he gets the *surgeon*, and not the *horse-doctor*, to set it; they also know, from experience in private life, that, whenever the working people have to choose some one to manage the affairs of any considerable number of them, they always choose the man of the most talent and integrity that they can find; and

"this is so natural, that it would be perfectly monstrous to suppose that the contrary would ever be the case; and when every man felt that *he was deeply interested in what would be done in Parliament*, would he not choose, to represent him, the man whom he thought most likely, from his ability as well as his integrity, to watch over his interests there?"

It has been denied that *universal suffrage* was ever the ancient practice in England, and what of *that*, we would ask? Are there no *new* things introduced to beat down the main body of the people and thus make it absolutely necessary to their preservation that they should have universal suffrage to use in their own defence? It was no longer ago than the "*Glorious Revolution*" that the landholders had to bear the *whole of the taxation of the country*, from which, at that time, they became relieved, and the burden was thrown almost wholly on the industrious part of the people. That was a *new thing*, which never would have taken place had the people possessed the power to choose their own representatives. This made the people regret the loss of the sovereign that the *glorious revolution* had dethroned, and this led the newly imported king to go to war to keep him off the throne; and to carry on the war, the system of *borrowing money*, in anticipation of the taxes, began, and *that* produced *paper-money*, and all its attendant evils, even down to the beggary and starvation of the people, which never would have been permitted, had the people themselves the power of making the laws. The *Riot-Act*: the *Septennial-Act*, and a thousand other acts, have all proceeded from the determination of those who govern the people, to cause such acts to be passed as shall effectually prevent them from having any voice in the choosing of those who shall make the laws, and thus leave them at the mercy of the most rapacious band of plunderers that ever were entrusted with power; who know that this power would immediately become feebleness, and the plunder cease, and an investigation into the various depositaries of the former plunderings, and a restitution made, as far as the estates of the plunderers will go towards that restitution, the very moment that the people themselves have the power to return representatives to parliament. Scores of circumstances may be enumerated that show the absolute necessity of instituting *universal suffrage*, even if it could be proved that it never had been the practice in this kingdom. Prove to us, not that it never has been known in this country, but, that it would be *injurious* to the main body of the people; and then, even, with all the proofs we have that it was formerly possessed, we will give up all desire for it, and never more utter a word in its favour; but, until you do that, until you can prove to us, not that it *never* has been the custom, but that it would be an *injury* to the people, we, most certainly, shall leave no stone unturned to endeavour to cause it to become the law of the land "*That every member of the community, HOWEVER POOR, shall have a vote in electing those delegates to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty and his life.*"

But, we contend that, formerly it *was* the law: that it was

take
tabl
of t
thing
the
or se
whic
Con
shar
ackr
RAF
he b
reco
" se
" po
" by
" fo
" up
" an
" L
" th
" th
on t
them
but,
righ
stat
of th
shir
pert
six y
been
prec
ing
man
heer
fit t
to fa
F
pro
find
back
Saz
ther
esta
the
con
was
def
this
stit
Saz
he r

taken from the people by the *Conquest*, and the subsequent establishment of the *Feodal System*; but, that, on the destruction of that system (the existence of which was, perhaps, the only thing that could give the colour of justice to the withholding of the suffrage) those people who had been the *villains* or *vassals*, or *serfs*, under that system, did not regain that independence which their Saxon forefathers had possessed previous to the *Conquest*; which independence was manifested by the right to share in the power to make the laws, and all historians agree in acknowledging they possessed such right. We will give what RAPIN says on this subject; whose authority must be impartial, he being a foreigner, and as that authority is founded on ancient records it must be decisive. He says "After the union of the seven kingdoms (*Heptarchy*), when the exercise of the legislative power, in the person of every individual, became impracticable, by reason of their remoteness, some change in the outward form was necessary in order to preserve the common-wealth upon the same principles, upon which it was first established; and as the whole kingdom was now divided into so many LITTLE REPUBLICS, or tythings, some person out of every tything, or borough, came to the *Wittena-gemotc*, to take care of the society which he belonged to." But the villains, or serfs, on the establishment of the *feodal system*, had no votes allowed them, seeing, that they were not, by law, considered as *freemen*; but, now that that system is no longer in existence, the ancient right of voting ought to be restored. Instead of which the statute of the 10 of Henry VI., cap 4, disfranchised nine-tenths of this nation, by limiting the right of voting, for knights of the shire, to persons possessing a certain amount of freehold property; whilst the septennial act disfranchises the whole people six years out of every seven years. Thus, then, have the people been cheated out of this right, and have, even in that *musty* and *precedental* (as *Jerry Bentham* would express it) mode of discussing the question, a clear right to its restoration; although, to a man of sense, it matters not one single rush, whether it has ever been possessed by the people:—that which a whole people think fit to adopt must and will be adopted; and if no *precedent* exist to favour its adoption, why, then, that people must *make* one.

For the lovers of *precedent* we will say a word or two on the practice of our ancestors in choosing their representatives.—We find that, upwards of twelve hundred years ago (a distance back, quite long enough to satisfy any reasonable man), the *Saxons*, after having subdued the Ancient Britons, or compelled them to take shelter in the fastnesses of the Welsh Mountains, established their own laws and customs here; one of these was the having no *standing army*, a thing, *Blackstone* tells us, that is contrary to the constitution of England:—another was, that it was imperative on every man to have arms in his possession, the defence of the country being equally the business of the whole; this, too, *Blackstone* declares to be part and parcel of the constitution. Historians tell us that our Saxon forefathers, (the *Saxons* were our *forefathers*, at least so says Mr. O'Connell, and he never errs) elected their own Magistrates, and made their own

laws; for which purpose they were occasionally assembled: these meetings were called the *wittena gemot*, which means, strictly, a meeting of the common people, (as *wittena geheate*, means a meeting of the high people,) and the *clashing of weapons* was their mode of expressing their approval of the proposed law; these meetings were held *annually*, and even *monthly*. Thus it continued during the *Heptarchy*; but, on that heptarchy being destroyed, and the whole formed into one kingdom, the REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM was adopted, it being impossible for the whole people to assemble in one meeting. Under the *representative system* their magistrates were frequently their representatives, and as we know that these were chosen by the voice of the whole people, we cannot doubt but that their other representatives were so chosen; for it would be to set reason at defiance, to pretend to suppose it possible for men, who had, hitherto, been accustomed to make the laws in their own persons, and who were remarkably tenacious of their liberty, to yield up that right to those whom they, themselves, did not appoint and over whom they had no control.

Under this new system those who were elected to the council of the nation assembled at stated times and always came armed, as an evidence of their independence. Those who were best qualified, whether from age, or great knowledge, or whose valour had earned for them great reputation, were allowed to speak before others; but, in all other respects there was the most perfect equality amongst them: no distinction of place, or rank, except that which was awarded them on account of great mental and physical qualities.

These assemblies elected the Kings and Generals, and decided all questions of peace and war. Great respect was, as our historians tell us, shown towards the royal family; and if the deceased king left a son, or sons, who had no *marked disqualification*, one of them was generally chosen to succeed; if not, some other branch of the family; or any man of title, or influence, arising from his great abilities, was elected. But, whoever succeeded, he neither claimed nor considered it as a matter of right; the *free suffrages* of the people, or of their *freely chosen* representatives, were the grounds and only rule by which he reigned. Hence it was that, as we find, the succession was frequently broken; and the smallest deviation from ancient usage, on the part of the kings, or the smallest violation, on their part, of the rights of the people, was always dangerous, and often fatal to them.—Whilst speaking on the subject of this elective power, we may remark, that *William the Conqueror*, even he who had had the power to make a fresh distribution of all the lands of the kingdom, when he came near to his end, acknowledged that he owed his crown to the *election of the people of England*, and, therefore, had *no right to bequeath it to any one*; but, he expressed a *wish* that his son might enjoy it after him. The formality of the election of Sovereign, indeed, is observed even down to our own day; for, at the Coronation of the Kings of England the Archbishop of Canterbury, who officiates, *asks* of the people on the east side whether *they are*

willing to do homage unto the king? The same question is asked of the people assembled on the south, on the west and on the north sides, and, on their replying "*God save the king*," the ceremony of crowning commences. Thus, then, there is "*Universal Suffrage*" in the election of *Sovereign*—the highest estate of the realm, that part in which is lodged the whole executive power of the state; and, yet, forsooth, in our *enlightened days*, there is required the possession of a certain portion of *dirt*, or *bricks and mortar*, to qualify a person to vote for members of the house of commons!—But, to return to our subject:—

The invasions of the Danes caused a suspension of these things until the coming of that really famous man ALFRED, who revived the *wittena-gemote*; and, now that the Heptarchy no longer existed, but that the whole were united into one nation, it being again found to be impracticable for the whole people to be assembled for the purpose of making the laws, and for other public business, he caused the re-introduction of the representative system; and thus *tything* or *free burghs* (which did not consist of precisely *ten families*, but of, generally, as many as lived in one town and a surrounding district) were formed, where representatives were to be sent to the national council; and, being, and after, the time of ALFRED, we find in the preambles of the laws, that the *Grefa-byrgths*, or *borough representatives*, are mentioned as attending the *wittena-gemote* instead of *calle theode*, or the whole people, or *every body*. And when, after the expulsion of the Danes, ALFRED was collecting and arranging the *old laws*, we find him consulting with the *wittena-gemote* (or, literally, the wise among the *high folk*) only; but, for making *new laws*, the *grefa-byrgths* (or, representatives of the *common folk*) were always summoned to assemble; these men, in their collective capacity, or when assembled as the "*collective wisdom of the nation*," were called a *wittena-gemote*, or meeting of the *common people*, or, as the phrase now is, a meeting of the *commons*. WILLIAM the CONQUEROR, who began his reign about 150 years after ALFRED, destroyed as many of the *Saxon records* as he could lay his hands on, in order that the people may cease to have any knowledge of the rights of their ancestors, and thus cease to be an obstacle to the establishment of *absolute despotism*; but, from the, necessarily imperfect, record which we yet possess, we find that the Saxon parliaments were composed of persons elected by the whole people; for every free man, that is, every man who was not a *real slave*, had a vote for a representative. This is amply shown in the collections of the laws of Edward the Confessor and of William the conqueror which are to be found in the Red book and in the MSS. rolls of the Exchequer, from which we will give one quotation, for which we are indebted to the writer of some most valuable letters under the signature of "*Revolutionist*," which have appeared in the "*Charter*" newspaper.—It is from the 35 institution of *Edward the Confessor's* collection, and is as follows:—"It is therefore enacted that ALL THE PEOPLE, and the whole of the County ought without fail there to meet

"(viz. at the *Folckmote*) each year, to wit, in the beginning of "the Calends of May, and faithfully and with unbroken oaths, "CONFEDERATE THEMSELVES, AND STRENGTHEN THEMSELVES, as sworn brothers." It then goes on to say that then the *head-men*, and *sent-men* by show of hands, and the county militia, and the "*free-men universally of the whole kingdom*," were to be sworn to their fealty; and, that, there "*faithful men shall be elected in FULL FOLCKMOTE to the common council*" (*wittena-gemote*), *for the general good of the kingdom throughout all the provinces and counties, and by each separate county in full Folckmote.*" So likewise the Sheriffs, Magistrates, and Lord-lieutenants (*Heretoch*, or commander of the County Militia), were to be elected, at a second meeting, held in October, "*therefore,*" says the institution "*the Folckmots ought always to be holden TWICE in each year, throughout all the Counties universally, and throughout all the provinces and places of the whole kingdom, for the peace and stability and confirmation of the kingdom, as is aforesaid.*" And thus we think (albeit we care not about *precedens* in such a case) we have shown that *Universal Suffrage* was anciently exercised by the people of England, and that too, let it *never be forgotten*, at that period of our history which is thus described by Dr. Johnson.

"A single jail, in ALFRED's golden reign,
 "Could half the nation's criminals contain;
 "Fair justice then, without constraint adored,
 "Held high the steady scale, but sheathed the sword;
 "No *Spies* were paid, no special juries known;
 "Blest age! but, ah! how different from our own!"

IS EDUCATION, OR "HEDDICATION", NECESSARY TO QUALIFY MEN TO EX- ERCEISE THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE?

THERE is a considerable number of persons who object to *Universal suffrage* because, they say, the working people are not possessed of wisdom sufficient to guide them in the choice of a representative. This we frequently hear from the lips of persons who affect to feel sorrow for the necessity, that, they are pleased to say exists, for withholding this undoubted right from the great body of the people; we say they *affect* to feel sorrow, for no man of sense *believes* in the existence of this want of wisdom, and therefore if such a man profess to believe it, he is a *hypocrite* and a real enemy to liberty and to justice; but if a man be found to really believe this, we can only say that he is so great a dullard, so totally destitute of any thing that can be called *common sense*, that we should place him as the *exception* to the rule, as the living witness of the truth of the rule, that *the whole people are sufficiently enlightened to exercise the elective franchise*. However, it is, generally speaking, the real enemies of freedom who say that the working people are not sufficiently educated ("*heddicated*" is the word that the late Mr. COBBETT always put into the mouths of the priggish knaves), to be en-

trusted with the *elective franchise*. We have already said that all who say this are either *fools* or *knaves*:—Nevertheless let us look at it a little.

First of all, those who argue for the *affirmative* of the proposition, ought to tell us what they mean by the word "*education*", and the *quantity* of the commodity which they think necessary for persons to possess before they exercise the right to vote for those who have to make the laws. They do not tell us whether it should be a knowledge of *reading and writing*, of *cyphering*, of *languages*, of *music*, of *dancing*, of *astronomy*, of *navigation*, of *chemistry*, or of *what* the "*education*" ought to consist. If *chemistry* be their standard, of what use would the knowledge of that be to the *shoemaker*—or *navigation* to the *tailor*—or, *astronomy* to the *tinker*—or, *music* to the *coppersmith*—or, *dancing* to the *carpenter*—or *languages* to the *labourer*? All very *fine things* to possess, but of no more *utility* to each, than is a bunch of gold seals; or a diamond brooch; or a gold ring, things that partake much more of the ornamental than of the useful; and although we will not go so far as to say that the knowledge of these things would be positively injurious to these several parties, yet we never hear the necessity of them urged, but we call to mind the saying of Cicero's father, who used to say, when speaking of the Syrian slaves, "the more Greek they know, "the greater knaves they are."

If it be none of these, it must be *reading and writing*. But, again, as to the *quantity*, the *sort*, the *degree* in which these are to be possessed. Are the voters to be required to read like the Clergy of the Church of England? No, that will not do as a standard, for, amongst them, the *bad* readers far outnumber the *good*! Where then is the *standard* to be found?—And if the art of *writing* be to be a part of the necessary qualification, in what branch of that are they to be adepts—*german-text*? engrossing hand?—round hand, or running hand? and where is the standard for testing the quality of such writing? Not, certainly, among the rich and noble; for, many of them can neither write a plain hand, nor even spell their words correctly; nor can one in a score of them write grammatically. No, no! none of these can be meant by the tooting asses, who, tossing back their heads and pricking up their ears, are constantly prating about the necessity there is for "*heducation amongst the LOWER CLASSES!*" Our oppressors tax us up to our very teeth, so that we are not able to get *what they call property*, nor afford time to acquire *what they call education*, and then they impudently tell us that we are not qualified to exercise the elective franchise, because of our *poverty and ignorance*!

On the subject of *real education* these gentry never deign to open their lips; that is quite unworthy of their notice: it is perfectly *vulgar* and *unpolite* to have a knowledge of any thing besides *book learning*! They advocate the acquiring of that *refined* and *intellectual* sort of knowledge that can never be available for the putting of food into the bellies, clothes upon the backs, and houses over the heads of the possessors of it.—They look with pity and, even with contempt upon the men who can plough the

fields, and who have a perfect practical knowledge of the whole of the affairs of a farm ;—and upon those who produce the clothing and the houses, unless they be able to read the trashy writings of a set of the most despicable fribbles, and the most useless creatures that swarm about the public press and who have the insolence to style themselves “*public instructors*”; a knowledge of whose sickening and puke-creating writings, forsooth, is to be acquired before a man shall be allowed to have the elective franchise, notwithstanding he may be able to produce things of real, solid and acknowledged utility to society! If the promulgators of this doctrine believe in it they are fools,—stark, staring fools,—if they do not believe in it, but press it upon public attention *merely to retard the progress of Universal Suffrage*, and its certain result, cheap and good government (which is the object of nine out of every ten of them), then they are, not merely *knaves*, but the falsest and most dastardly of hypocrites, and the blackest of tyrants, from whom we ought to turn with disgust, unless we be prepared to smite them on the mouth whenever they presume to pester us with their villanous doctrines. As some of the sticklers for the necessity of greater “*heddication*”, often (in order to show us how deeply read they are) refer us to the *ancients*, let us see what some of those ancients thought of that which is now considered by these *heddication-mongers* as being the great proof of learning, viz, RHETORIC; or, as the *botheration O’Connell* has it, “*INTENSE ELOQUENCE.*” Cornelius Agrippa says:—“In like manner did *Cicero* provoke *Anthony*, to the great mischief of the Empire; and *Demosthenes* incensed *Philip*, to the ruin of the *Athenians*; and there is no State or Government but has been *highly injured* by this *wicked art*: no society of men that ever lent their ears to the *charms of eloquence*, that has not been extremely *mischiefed thereby*: wherefore *SOCRATES* thinks *rhetoricians* worthy of no respect, and will not allow them any power in a well ordered commonwealth. And *PLATO* excludes them from his commonwealth, with the same *contempt* that he rejects *PLAYERS* and *POETS*, and not without reason; for, there is nothing more *dangerous*, in civil affairs, than this *deluding mystery*, as from thence all *prevaricators*, *juggling shufflers*, *backbiters*, *sycophants*, and all other *lowd and vile tongued* persons derive their *malice and knavery.*”

VOTE BY BALLOT.

ON this subject we shall offer but a very few words; first, because the subject is, in itself, so simple; and, secondly, because it is, on the face of it, so just, that, when the suffrage shall be *universal*, the people should be protected in the exercise of that right. But, until that be the case, if only a small part of the community hold the vote, and thereby virtually represent the great mass of the people, then the multitude ought to know how those, who hold the power of voting, exercise that power, in order that they may know how they are represented. And as

regards the ballot when universal suffrage, is the law of the land, the electors will *then* hold the vote in their *own right*, and not as a trust for others, and consequently ought to be protected in its exercise, seeing that it is not a matter about which any other persons have any right to inquire, any more than they have any right to exercise any control over any other matter relating to the conscience of man. Another good that the ballot will tend to produce is the peaceful, quiet, and orderly mode of managing elections, and that, of itself, will be no little good; for, under the system that has long been practised at contested elections, such noise, turmoil and riot have hitherto been produced as to cause the utmost disgust in the minds of all decent and orderly persons; *Rousseau* or *Voltaire* (we know not which of them,) speaking of English Elections, remarked that "Englishmen have but *forty* days of freedom in *seven* years, and they use those forty days "in such a way as proves that they *ought* to be slaves for the "rest of the *seven* years."

ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS AND PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

THESE two matters will not require much notice, particularly as it is undoubted that they were both, in by-gone days, the practice of this country, therefore the *gentlemen of precedents* will not have a word to say against them, and then we shall have but an easy task in showing that they are both just and reasonable in themselves, and likely to be of great benefit to the people. We have already seen, that, in the days of our *Saxon* forefathers, several centuries before the Conquest, the meetings of the law-makers (wittena-gemote) were held, at the farthest, *once a year*, and often at the *new and full moon*; but, after the Conquest, when *WILLIAM* had destroyed as many of the *Saxon* institutions as prudence would permit, it almost ceased to be the custom, he, himself, having assembled a *general council* but a few times, and that only in times of difficulty and danger, and in order to conciliate the minds of the people; and it was not until the Reign of *Edward the Third* that the parliament rose into greater consideration and acquired more authority than at any period since the Conquest; this, we must recollect, was caused by an act which provided that "*a parliament should be holden every year once*, and *oftener*, if *NEED BE*," as until this time parliaments were called together only when the crown wanted some favour. Thus, then, there was a revival of *part of the old, Saxon, institutions*. It has been contended by some, that it was not a *new* parliament, that was thus *holden every year*; but we think that ancient records show that it was a *fresh elected* parliament: that the *same persons* were never called together again, *without having undergone the ordeal of an election*; the same thing is borne out by *RAPIN* the historian, who says that, "*in those days parliaments never sat for more than one Session, un-*

46 ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS AND PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

"less business required a short prorogation." Blackstone contradicts this by saying "not that he (the king) is, or ever was, obliged by these statutes to call a new parliament every year; but only to permit a parliament to sit annually for the redress of grievances, and dispatch of business, if need be." But the records that we are about to give, show that the *practice* was contrary to what Blackstone says. The proofs that we shall adduce of this, will be also our proofs that it was the law, and the *practice*, of our forefathers to *pay their representatives* for their services; which was enacted by statute of Edward the Third, by which it was provided that *four shillings a day* should be the amount of pay for a *knight of the shire*; and that *two shillings a day* should be the pay for the representative of a *City or Borough*: that is to say, limiting their claims for their services, to those specific sums. These proofs we take from "*Lee's History of Lewes*;" and from extracts from the court books of Ipswich. The first-named work contains a list of Members of Parliament for Lewes, for a period of one hundred and seventy-five years; that is, from the year 1298, in the reign of *Edward the First*, to the year 1473, in the reign of *Edward the Fourth*, which shows that parliaments were (even before the reign of *Edward the Third*), not merely *annual*, but that they were chosen for the *Sessions* only, as the reader will perceive that there is one instance recorded, in the Lewes list of members, of there having been *two* parliaments chosen in one year. The History also shows that there was *no property qualification*, but that mere simple citizens were sent, and it proves, as we have already said, that the representatives were paid for their services, for it says, that, in the year 1401, which was in the second year of the reign of *Henry the Fourth*, *John Marnyott* and *John Mason* were elected, and *ten pounds sixteen shillings* were paid to them for fifty-four days attendance in Parliament (that is *two shillings each, per day*). We will here extract from Lee's History, a short list of persons chosen for Lewes.

A.D.

1360.—Godfrey Wolfenpope, and Walter Nynge, were elected.

1361.—Thomas Linfield, and William Brochere, were elected.

1361.—Richard Fernour, and Thomas Linfield, were elected.

(Two Parliaments to this year.)

1362.—Richard Fernour, and Thomas Linfield, were elected.

1363.—Robert York, and William Darnell, were elected.

1364.—William Spicer, and Thomas Morreys, were elected.

The list taken from the extracts from the court books of *Ipswich* is curious, respecting the payment, merely, of the members; it is as follows.

1448.—John Smith and William Weathereld were paid £3 3s. 6d. each for the Session

1460.—William Worsop and John River, 13d. per day each.

1462.—William Worsop and John Lopham; the former to have 20d. a-day at York; at any nearer place, 16d.; at London, 12d.; and Lopham, 12d. per day everywhere.

1469.—John Timperley, Jun., and John Alfray, of Hendley;

A.D.

Timperly, at 8d. per day. Alfray served gratis, in consideration of his being made a free burgess.

1472.—William Worsop and John Wallworth; Worsop, at 5s. per week; Wallworth to have 3s. 4d. per week.

1477.—James Hobart and John Temperley, at 20s. 8d., or two marcs each.

1483.—Thomas Baldry and John Wallworth; Baldry, at 2s. a-day; Wallworth, at 1s.

1494.—John Fastolf and Ed. Bocking, at £1 6s. 8d. each, if at Westminster. If further off, to be ordered by the Great Court. The Great Court ordered Fastolf £4; to Bocking, £3.

1509.—William Spencer and Thomas Hall. Spencer to have 40s. It appears, however, that he was paid £2 6s. 8d.

1559.—Thomas Seckford, jun., Esq.; and Robert Barker. Barker had £31 4s.

1592.—Robert Barker and Zach. Lock, Esq.; Lock had £5.

1620.—Robert Snelling and William Cage, Gent.; £50 each.

1640.—John Gurdon and William Cage, Gent.; Cage had £100 on the 5th of December, 1643, Gurdon had £100; and Cage £50 additional.

1680.—John Wright and Gilbert Linfield; Wright received £60; and Linfield £20.

While upon this subject we may as well state here, that *Prynne* discovered, in the White Tower of London, copies of the original writs to the Sheriffs, directing a new election for almost every year after the regulation in the reign of Edward the Third; and he informs us, that there were but two or three disputed elections, and not one double return for above two hundred years from that time.

We will say a few words about ministers *sitting and voting in parliament*; these things, we think, would, under a *radically reformed* parliament, be quickly put an end to: and that the admirable system which is followed in America, would be adopted here. In that country there are no chancellors of exchequer, no secretaries of state, or of war, or of the home department, or of the Admiralty, admitted to seats in either house of Congress; there is no *Treasury bench*, nor any ministers in either house; nor can any man be a member of Congress who receives one single six-pence of public money under the Executive; nor can any man be allowed to fill any office within two years of the time when he ceases to be a member of either house, if such office shall have been created, or the emoluments of such office shall have been augmented, during the time that he was a member of either of those houses. These things, we think, are amongst the very best fruits that *Universal Suffrage* would be sure to produce in this country.

We will close this part of our work with a quotation from the writings of the late Mr. COBBETT, at page 802 of Vol. 13. dated May, 1808. He says "We have so long been accustomed "to look upon seats in parliament as a benefit to the holder; "we have so long seen men struggle for this sort of possession "with more eagerness and greater risk than they struggle for

"almost any other sort of possession; we have, for so long time,
 "been accustomed to see seats in the house of Commons openly
 "offered for sale, by public advertisement, and offers to
 "purchase, made in the like public manner; our minds have
 "been so long familiarised to this set of ideas, that it appears,
 "at last, to have become a settled notion, that a seat in the
 "house of Commons is a valuable acquisition, and, of course,
 "that the possessor, or occupier, *ought to pay for it*. But, all
 "this is in direct hostility to the latter, as well as the spirit of
 "those statutes and those usages, which constitute what is
 "called, *the constitution* of England, according to which, a seat
 "in the house of Commons is *no benefit*, but exacts from the
 "person placed in it, certain *duties* which he is *obliged*, under
 "heavy penalties, to perform; and, therefore, a man, accord-
 "ing to the English constitution, can no more be compelled to
 "pay the expences attending his election to serve as member of
 "parliament (provided he does not, by his own act, agree for
 "such payment), any more than he can be compelled to pay
 "the expences, which may attend his being elected to serve as
 "Constable, or Tything-man, or Churchwarden, or even as
 "Juryman. There is, preparatory to an election, a *writ*, or
 "*command*, issued by the king, to the electors of such a place,
 "or district, to elect one or more members to *serve* in parlia-
 "ment. When this command is fulfilled, another command is
 "issued to, and served upon the person or persons elected, who
 "are, in this second writ, *commanded* to give their personal
 "attendance in the parliament house; and, the law is, that the
 "place for which a man is chosen, shall *pay him*, at a certain
 "rate for his attendance. All this concurs in the notion, that
 "a seat in parliament imposes a burthensome duty, instead of
 "being a possession of emolument. If the person chosen,
 "refuse to give his attendance, in obedience to the writ; or, if
 "he neglect to attend, no matter from what motive, he is liable
 "to be punished, even to *fine and imprisonment*."

ON PROPERTY QUALIFICATION FOR MEMBERS.

A HALF-A-DOZEN words are more than enough on this subject,
 seeing that, when the people have the power of voting for
 members of Parliament, there should be no qualification, except
 the *choice of the people*, themselves, required of any man, or it
 ceases to be the free choice of the people; and thus, if one set
 of men propose one hundred pounds a year as the qualification
 to sit in Parliament, another set of men may propose a hundred
 thousand pounds a year, and thus make it almost a matter of
nomination on the part of the Government, instead of leaving
 it to the free choice of the whole people themselves to elect the
 man who they think the best qualified to serve them by reason
 of his great understanding, his integrity and those other requisite

moral qualities that are so necessary in such a case, and which, wealth is, not only not capable of creating, but is rather, calculated to prevent its possessor from attaining. It is not to be supposed that the people, for whose welfare a representative, under *Universal Suffrage*, would be sent to parliament, would choose an incapable or an unworthy man; but, as every day's experience shows, they would undoubtedly elect the exact persons that ought to be elected, they never, as our extract from Mr. Cobbett's writings has so well expressed, "employ *miserable pettifoggers* if they can avoid it—they never in case of a broken limb employ a *horse-doctor* in preference to a *surgeon*; and whenever they have to choose some one to manage the affairs of any considerable number of them, they always choose the man of the most talent and integrity that they can find." Therefore we may safely leave the matter to their own good sense, and not impose shackles and restraints where there cannot be the smallest necessity for them.

ON PHYSICAL FORCE.

DURING the agitation on behalf of the *Charter*, which the Working-men's associations have put forth, there has been some difference of opinion on the subject of the use of moral and physical force in procuring the passing of that Charter into a law; and, in our opinion, the *moral force party* were aiding the enemies of the people, by so strongly declaiming against the *physical force party*, even to almost *denouncing* them to the government, and preaching up the efficiency of moral force, with all that placid and delightful resignation that formerly shone with such benignity over the countenances of those who inculcated "*passive obedience and non-resistance*."

Mr. COBBETT used to say that it was bad policy to make it so prominent in the king's speeches that "his majesty was rejoiced at receiving the strong assurances of the *pacific* disposition of foreign powers," it being more likely that foreigners will let you remain at *peace* if they perceive that you are *prepared for war*.

Even the opposers of fighting do not deny the right of the people to have arms, and to use them, but only in self defence and against *attacks*. If then, the government absolutely refuse all that the people pray for, and even go on robbing the people of the little freedom now left, without giving absolute corporal punishment, such as kicks and cuffs and scourgings and stabbings, is it at all likely that a *remonstrance* from the people, accompanied with a declaration that they will *not, under any circumstances, have recourse to ARMS*, will induce the government to relax in their refusal of their demands? What the devil do they care for their "*moral force*," for their "*peaceful attitude*" (which means kneeling, or the "*attitude*" of prayer)? The people say "we demand *such and such things*, and we are resolved, at all hazards, to get them." "Oh! you are," say the

half-frightened government. "What? do you intend, if we "refuse your petition, to take them by *violence*?" "Oh! no." say the demanders, "God forbid! we mean no such thing as *fighting*; and if even one of our best and most faithful friends "were to hint at the *lawfulness* of being *armed*, we would immediately denounce him as an enemy, if not a *traitor*, and "half invite the government to stop him. We mean to succeed "by *argument* and by assuming a *great and imposing* MORAL "ATTITUDE.—We mean to *persuade* the wolf that it is for *its* "*own benefit* that he give up the lamb into whose body he has "just driven his murderous teeth." "Oh! aye, *persuade* away "then," says the "*Thing*", "and," thanking you for the "*wolf*" and the "*lamb*," depend upon it we shall not feel alarmed at "your petitioning, or at your *moral* force, but will quietly *finish* "*our repast*."

For our parts, we think, that, while very *big* and *swaggering* talk about fightings and violence, will not inspire much *fear* on the part of the oppressors, the expression of a resolute determination not to fight, "*come what may*," will give them *pleasure*,—they will consider that it is *fear* that prompts the determination, and they will act accordingly.

That the people have a right to resist oppression, or to resist an abrogation of any part of the constitution, we have abundant proof; our queen, herself, is a *living* proof, for had it not been for *resistance* on the part of the people, she would certainly not have been on the throne of this kingdom at this moment; but would, possibly have been in Germany, quietly engaged in the manufacture of "*prooms*", or in the cultivating of *sour krout*. The Whigs, whose habit it long has been to refer us to the time of the "*glorious revolution*," at that time carried the doctrine of the *right of resistance* to such an extent as even to cause a man, named *Anderton*, to be hanged, for having denied the existence of this right; and we are sure that the *ever-consistent* Whigs, of the present day, will not gainsay what their progenitors said, nor act in opposition to their doings. The Tories too, from BLACKSTONE to our time, have acknowledged the right of resistance in case of a departure from the constitution. Even the late Lord ELDON, when he was Attorney General, at the trial of HARDY, HORNE TOOKE and others, said, that the King of England ought to die, and that *he trusted he would die*, if he attempted to alter the constitution as it then existed, and which he had sworn to uphold and defend. LOCKE tells us, that, "Whenever the legislators endeavour to reduce the people to "slavery under arbitrary power, they put themselves in a state "of war with the people, who are thereupon absolved from any "further obedience, and are left to the common refuge which "God hath provided for all men against force and violence. "Whosoever, therefore, the legislature shall, either by ambition, fear, folly, or corruption, endeavour to grasp to themselves, or put into the hands of another, an absolute power "over the lives, liberties and estates of the people, by this "breach of trust they forfeit the power that the people had put "into their hands for quite contrary ends, and it devolves to

"the people, who have a right to resume their original liberty, and, by the establishment of a new legislative (such as they shall think fit), provide for their own safety and security, which is the end for which they are in society."

ON THE RIGHT OF HAVING ARMS, AND RIGHT OF RESISTANCE.

THE right of resisting oppression is closely connected with the right to have arms; and on this subject we are told in the writings of *Matthew of Westminster*, "that by the Code of Alfred, every man was constituted a freeholder, and compelled to perform military service according to his lands."

By the 13th of Edward the First we are told that "constables were elected, who were bound to *inspect the arms of the people twice a year, and present defaulters*;" for by a previous statute of Winchester "every man was commanded to have in his house harness to keep the peace—that every man between fifteen and sixty years of age, shall be assessed and sworn to *armoury, according to his lands.*"

By the 13th of Henry the Fourth "Justices, Sheriffs, and Under-Sheriffs were empowered to call for the assistance of 'l Knights, Gentlemen, yeomen, labourers, servants, and a justices, who were all bound by the statute of Winchester to *have harness or armour.*"

By the 33rd of Henry the Eighth. every man was bound to *possess himself with such arms as were then in use, and if a labourer came to a master without arms his master was bound to find them, and stop the cost of them out of his wages.*

Fortescue says, "It is the duty of all men to have arms."

BRAUTON says, "It is the right and duty of all freemen to have arms of defence and peace."

ALAND says "It has been the custom of the nation to train up the freeholders to discipline;" and, therefore, as we have just seen that Alfred constituted every man a freeholder, it follows that *every man was trained to the use of arms.*

Queen Elizabeth, in an address to her Parliament, said, "You that be lieutenants and gentlemen of command in your counties, I request you to take care that the *people be well armed and in readiness upon all occasions.*"

Blackstone declares "that the laws of England recognize no distinction between the *Citizen and the Soldier.*"

Blackstone B. 1. C. 1. says "the last auxiliary right of the Subject, that I shall at present mention, is that of having arms for their defence suitable to their condition and degree, and such as are *allowed by the law.* Which is also declared by the same statute. 1st. W. and M. sta. 2. c. 2. and is indeed a *public allowance* (under due restrictions) of the natural right of resist-

"*ance* and self-preservation, when the sanctions of society and laws are found insufficient to restrain the violence of oppression." Well and what is *oppression*, we would ask? Why Blackstone himself, in the same chapter, tells us: he says—"every wanton and causeless restraint of the will of the subject, whether practised by a monarch, a nobility, or a popular assembly, is a degree of tyranny."

Again, the same writer goes on to say "to vindicate those rights, when actually violated or attacked, the subjects of England are entitled, in the first place, to the regular administration and free course of justice in the courts of law; next, to the right of petitioning the king, and parliament, for redress of grievances; and, lastly, to the right of *having* and *using arms* for self-preservation and defence."

De Lolme says, p. 317, "This right of opposing violence, in whatever shape, and from whatever quarter it may come, is so generally acknowledged, that the courts of Justice have sometimes *grounded their judgments upon it.*" He says, further, "Governments are apt to overrate the advantages of their own situation, they think that they may venture upon any thing. But when they see that all their actions are exposed to public view,—that in consequence of the celerity with which all things become communicated, the whole nation forms, as it were, one continued IRRITABLE body, no part of which can be touched without exciting an universal TREMOR, they become sensible that the cause of each individual is really the cause of all; and that to attack the lowest among the people, is to attack the WHOLE PEOPLE." And, addressing Governments, he says, "you wish an *union*, a *coalition*, which cannot be obtained but by a slow and peaceable process, forbear therefore continually to shake the vessel."

And again he says "By the expulsion of a King (*James the Second*) "who had violated his oath, the doctrine of resistance THAT ULTIMATE RESOURCE OF AN OPPRESSED PEOPLE, was confirmed beyond a doubt."

ALGERNON SIDNEY, in warning CHARLES the first, of his dangerous course of conduct, said "the people of England know how to preserve their liberty, or to vindicate the violation of it; and the more patient they have been, the more inflexible will they be when they resolve to be so no longer. These who are so foolish as to put them upon such courses, do to their cost find that there is a difference between lions and asses, and he is a fool who knows not that swords were given to men that none might be slaves but such as know not how to use them!"

Thus far for these eminent authorities: but we will produce a little more evidence, which, if it does not prove that we moderns, in England, have the right to resist oppression and tyranny, yet will serve to show what the ancients thought on that subject, and how they acted to put an end to tyranny. This evidence we have in a work that was published in 1802, by Cox and Baylis, London, and was translated into the French

language that same year by M. BOUVET, who was employed, by the ENGLISH GOVERNMENT, on that translation, for the purpose of circulating the work in France, hoping that some *Hero* some real *Patriot* might be induced from reading it, to *free that country from the rule of NAPOLEON!!!* The devil is in it, then, if this be not good evidence in this case; but, however, good, or bad, here are the extracts:—

CICERO tells us that “the Greeks attributed the honours of “gods to those who killed tyrants—they were consecrated to “immortality and almost deified!”

SOLON’s law decreed “death to a tyrant who oppressed the “State, and *all those who held any office* under the govern- “ment while the tyranny existed.”

PLATO informs us that the Greeks, “if they could not expel a “tyrant by accusing him to the citizens, would dispatch him by “*secret means.*”

XENOPHON tells us that the Greeks “would not let murderers “enter their temples; but, nevertheless, they would in those “very temples erect statues in honour of those who killed “tyrants, thinking them *worthy of being ranked amongst their “gods.*”

IN ROME the *Valerian* law decreed that “if any man took “magistracy upon himself, without the command of the people, “it was lawful for any one to kill him.”

PLUTARCH, says that it “was lawful, before any judgment “passed, to kill any one who but *aspired* to tyranny.”

By the CONSULAR LAW it was lawful to kill any man that went about to “create magistrates, without reference and ap- “peal to the people.”

POLYBIUS says: “those who conspire against tyrants are not “the worst and meanest of citizens, but the *most generous* and “those of the *greatest virtue.*”

CICERO, speaking of the assassination of Julius Cæsar, ex- claims:—“*What act more glorious, more worthy of eternal “memory hath been done in the world.*”

SENECA says, “a tyrant could receive no injustice but to be “allowed to live, and that the most lawful way to destroy him “is the *readiest*, whether by *force* or by *fraud*; for against beasts “of prey men use the *toil* and the *net* as well as the *spear* and “the *lance.*”

TERTULLIAN says “all remedy, therefore, against a tyrant, “is EHUD’s dagger, without which all laws were fruitless and “we helpless. This is the most high court of justice whither “MOSES brought the *Egyptian*:—whither EHUD brought *Eglo-* “—whither SAMPSON brought the *Philistines*:—whither SAMUEL “brought *Agag*:—whither JEHOIDA brought *Athaliah*:—whither “Jael brought *Sisera*:—and whither JEHU brought the *she-* “*tyrant Jezebel* who had caused NABOTH to be murdered on a “false charge of blasphemy. *Devotion* and *action* go well to- “gether, for a tyrant is not that kind of *Devil* that is to be cast “out by *fasting* and *prayer.*”

In drawing this little work to a close, we cannot avoid remarking that the great stumbling block that stands in our way to attain salutary reforms in the practice of conducting our public affairs, is that very faction who glory in being descended from those who drove the tyrant James the Second from the throne, and who have contrived to fasten themselves, like leeches, on the plundered people, from that time down to the present day; and who, because the Radicals are opposed to being plundered, whether by *Whigs* or *Tories*, and complain in loud and indignant terms at the base *Whigs*, who, when out of office, used to be so indignant against *Tory* plunderers, not only do not redress the evils of which they themselves complained, but, now that they are in power, actually *increase* them; because, we say, the Radicals complain of such conduct, the *Whigs* have endeavoured in many ways to silence them; amongst other means, they have tried to effect it by nick-naming them "*Tory-Radicals*;" as if a man who does not like villany in a *whig*, must therefore be a *Tory*! This is too *barefaced*: too *fimsy* a trick! The stupid dolts imagine that it is not seen through! Why every man, who is not a natural fool, knows that the *nick-name*, *Tory-Radical*, is given to a man who is so sincere in his Radical principles as to blame the *whigs*, because of their strong leaning towards *Tory* tricks:—or, who blames those, who, *professing* themselves Radicals, lean towards *whigism*:—or, who will not vote contrary to his principles, that is to say, with *Mr. Hume*, that "*black is white*," for the mere purpose of keeping the base *Whigs* in office:—or who, having detected the *Whigs* in some base and nefarious trick, has the manliness to denounce them:—or, who would accept the restoration of his rights from *any* government, whether *Whig* or *Tory*, if such a miracle could be worked as to incline the hearts of either faction towards justice!—or, who is as ready to hurl the *Whigs* from power, as he would the *Tories*, if they stand between him and his rights:—or, who does not think that the sun would fail to rise to-morrow, if the *Whigs* were turned out of power to-day:—or, who thinks that the *whigs* are as *false* and *treacherous*, as the *Tories* are *insolent* and *tyrannical*. Every man, in short, knows that it is a name that *whig* insolence has invented in order to frighten honest Radicals from exposing the villany of the *Whigs*, and, thereby, prevent their retaining place and power, unless they do those things for the people, which, *when they were out of office*, they were the loudest to clamour for.

The great object of true Radicals, is the restoration of the *ancient Saxon constitution* of England, and to get rid of all the innovations that powerful villany, whether *Whig* or *Tory*, has made upon it. It was the object of *ALFRED*, who was the wisest and best king that ever reigned, to let the *government* of England be carried on amongst, and by, the people in the various Cities, Wards, Hundreds, and Tythings; whilst the object of the new fangled Borough-mongering, Malthusian, tyrannical and murder producing "*thing*," that now rules with a worse than Egyptian despotism, is to cause what little of

power yet remains in the hands of the people, to be engulfed in their centralizing vortex here in London. The former of these systems was *Republican*, the latter is *Despotism*; we desire the restoration of the former in all its purity, and the total annihilation of the latter; and these things, please God, we will never cease to struggle for until they be obtained.

FINIS.

The CORBETT CLUB meet on the first Wednesday of every month, at the DR. JOHNSON TAVERN, Bolt Court, Fleet Street.

Particulars may be had of Mr. B. Tilly, *Hon. Sec.* 92, Fleet Street.